



WHY IS ARCHITECTURE THE "MISTRESS ART"?

By Professor G. BALDWIN BROWN, M.A. [*Hon. A.*].

Read before the Edinburgh Architectural Association, 26th February 1920.

IS it the Mistress Art? At a meeting of an architectural association we may confidently make this claim for it, but it would certainly not be allowed by the public at large. In popular estimation by far the most important and interesting art of form is the art of painting. To the "man in the street" architecture is not an art at all—it is just building for purposes of use and convenience. Sculpture he takes as a matter of course; there seems to him no difficulty in copying in solid stone or metal a natural shape with three dimensions that can be measured and accurately reproduced. Painting is, however, something quite different. Have we not all watched the pavement artist with his little crescent of spectators, and seen how their eyes open in wonder as the slice of salmon on the plate rises up in solid succulent thickness, or Mr. Lloyd George's alert countenance starts into life as the practised fingers juggle with the chalks? Perhaps in the crowd there is an Italian figure-man with a tray of plaster images in the round copied from famous statues. Do the bystanders gaze on these with equal interest? So little are they disposed so to regard the images that the Italian figure-man himself, once so familiar in our streets, is now well-nigh extinct, whereas the pavement artist is not only always with us, but has developed into the picture palace, the ultimate assertion of the supreme attraction for the multitude of the graphic art.

The attractiveness resides largely in the element of mystery, which fascinates in drawing while it is absent from modelled work in the round. The latter represents an object in all its three dimensions in a mass of a suitable material that itself possesses the three dimensions; whereas in the former case there is the illusion of solid form produced upon a surface known all along to be flat. That this should be possible savours of the marvellous, and the admiration of the uncritical spectator is readily excited by work that is really of the most primitive kind. "Better than I saw not who saw the life," wrote the poet Dante of representations of the human figure on the floor of one of the ledges in Purgatory, that can only have been meagre outline drawings like those we now see on the pavement of the cathedral of Siena.

The popularity of the painter's art depends, too, in no small measure on the personal interest connected with it. A fine building or a great public monument of sculpture we accept for what it is in itself. In regarding it we may or may not take account at the moment of its author, but this, in any case, is only noted in passing as an accidental though interesting detail. In the case of a painting, however, the most outstanding fact about it is its authorship. In common parlance the name of the painter stands for the work. Everyone knows what is meant by the *Tiepolo* or the *Gainsborough* of the Scottish National Gallery, but we do not say the *Chantreys* of George Street or the *Princes Street*

Adams or *Playfairs*, but speak of *William Pitt* and the *Register House*. Especially in the days in which we live is there a tendency to exaggerate the personal element in the work of the painter. The common note of the various so-called "movements" in modern painting is independence—the assertion of individuality. Without this we are told the art would stagnate and become orthodox and lifeless. So tender is the artistic public to the idiosyncrasies of the painter that a sort of universal tolerance is claimed for him, so that he may "express himself" in unfettered freedom. We hear, indeed, far too much of this plea. Mere individuality is of no more value in art than in any other sphere, and in any case it is not easy to say where self-expression ends and self-assertion takes its place. Even where there is no self-assertion—no crowing from the top of the little mound, "I am I, damn everybody else"—but rather the expression of a sane and cultured mind, the value in art of "the personal note" may easily be exaggerated, and one of the main purposes of this paper is to show that there have been periods when the arts flourished greatly, though the personal element was altogether in abeyance.

This personal element, as has been said, is to no small extent responsible for the position painting holds in the eyes of the public. This was the case in Italy in the great period of her art. Vasari wrote a collection of *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors, and Architects* of his own time and country, but nobody refers to the fascinating work by its full title. It is always called Vasari's *Lives of the Painters*—for these are the real heroes of the story, made familiar and interesting to us by the wealth of biographical detail he has lavished upon them. In following the history of Italian art throughout this period we are constantly coming on proofs of the popularity and preponderating influence of this art. Ghiberti, in his famous Old Testament gates for the Baptistery, tries to paint in bronze—that is, to secure in the statuary's material—bronze—the effects of perspective and distance, as well as the multiplication of details, that are only suitable to the graphic art. Later on, in the early part of the sixteenth century, at the culminating period of the arts of form in Italy, there is a more striking instance still in the decoration in fresco of the vault of the Sistine Chapel. This building was the State Chapel of the Vatican Palace, which is one of the vastest structures of the kind in the world, erected and embellished by the ambitious prelates of the Renaissance, with the most ample resources in men and materials at their command. In the normal order the chapel would have been a great architectural achievement, adorned, no doubt, by the efforts of the best decorative painters and sculptors of the day, but primarily and essentially, like Mr. Bentley's Westminster Cathedral, *architecture*. Look, however, at what actually happened. The building itself is not architecture at all. It is a plain barn-like structure, with no artistic pretensions of any kind, and the programme of the designer was governed by the idea of providing vast plain spaces of wall and roof for the benefit of the decorative painter. It is the materialisation of Mr. Ruskin's famous paradox about architecture, notable as embodying the very falsest principle ever enunciated about the Fine Arts—the paradox that all the architect is called on to do is to provide a sort of scaffolding or a support and framework for the display of sculpture and painting. When Michelangelo was set to work on the plain flat barrel vault of the chapel he began by painting upon it an imaginary scheme of feigned architecture, the spaces in which he proceeded to fill with his decorative figures and groups. This meant a complete subordination of the architect to the painter, and is a striking object-lesson in the relative position of the arts in this conspicuous period of modern art.

In the Greek world a similar phenomenon can be discerned, though it is not at first sight conspicuous. The relations of painting and sculpture in Greece are not easy to understand, because the former art is hardly represented by extant remains, while sculptured monuments have come down to us in ample numbers. The latter is also the case with architecture, so that we naturally regard the Greeks as good architects and pre-eminent sculptors, their efforts in painting being practically negligible. Yet ancient writers talk far more about their painters than about their carvers or builders, and it is an historical fact that painting seems to have taken the lead of its sister art at all the periods

of change and of advance. The great age of Athenian art is ushered in by the paintings of Polygnotus, not the sculpture of Pheidias, which came a generation later. The painters Zeuxis and Parrhasius precede Scopas and Praxiteles in the creation of the Greek art of the fourth century B.C. The first-named painter is a proof of the exaggerated esteem in which his art was held by the people. He was thronged by crowds at Olympia, gained so much money that he gave away his pictures instead of selling them, and attended the games in a robe on which his name was inwoven in letters of gold. Apelles the painter, not the sculptor Lysippus, is the dominant figure in the art of the age of Alexander. When Aristotle wants to give the name of an artist who represents in his work the highest ethical ideal he instances the painter Polygnotus, not Pheidias, and the special characteristics of the sculpture of Lysippus, by which he modernised the later classical style, were due, we are told, to his following the advice given to him by the painter Eupompus, to draw his inspiration from nature as a whole. In accordance with all this we find in Pliny's account of ancient artists—the *Vasari's Lives* of the classical period—so much said about the painters that the author has to apologise for his volubility.

It may surprise us that the work of Polygnotus attracted so much attention, because from the technical point of view it was extremely primitive. It achieved, however, the miracle that makes the pavement picture a wonder to the passer-by, and produced the illusion of natural forms on a flat surface. That a painted surface should be like the solid objects of the world was so wonderful that this likeness seemed to be the be-all and end-all of the art, and thus is explained the Greek doctrine of painting and sculpture—a doctrine extended to other arts also—that they were based on imitation, or, as the Greeks called it, *mimesis*. In a very unfortunate moment Plato took "imitation" as the fundamental principle of art, and he handed the doctrine on to Aristotle, who makes it the basis of his treatment of the arts in the *Poetics*. Notice now the curious result. Imitation, *mimesis*, is made to explain not only painting and sculpture but the dance, music and poetry, and about all of these arts suggestive and interesting remarks are offered by the philosopher. The point, however, is that throughout the whole of this æsthetic treatise, the most important work of the kind that has come down from antiquity, there is no mention of architecture. Architecture, in which the Hellenic genius in art achieved some of its greatest triumphs, is not regarded by Plato and Aristotle as an art at all. Commentators on the *Poetics* do not seem to have noticed this very curious phenomenon. Professor Butcher's well-known edition of the treatise contains no note or explanation of the extraordinary omission. The truth is that Greek æsthetic thinkers were so obsessed with the notion that art was imitation, that any art which, like architecture, failed to satisfy the definition was ignored as if it were not an art at all. This, of course, was an impossible situation, and we find later on architecture recognised as an art with its own principles applied to it, but not brought into line with sculpture and painting. Vitruvius has some very sensible, though not profound, remarks as to the principles of architecture, but does not compare it with its sister arts of form, while these latter have ever since been treated on the lines laid down by the Greeks, and their relation to nature, their imitative character, has always been accepted as fundamental.

It is not difficult, however, to see that when we have certain arts of form appealing to our æsthetic sense through the eye, just as music appeals to us through the ear, common sense demands that we should search for principles that apply to all these arts of form alike, for in the nature of things they must have a great deal in common. Now, if we can clear our minds from this obsession of *mimesis* such principles are readily discernible. In all these arts, architecture, painting, sculpture, the dance—for this has been aptly defined as "sculpture in motion"—there is an imitative, or to use a better word, a representative element, though it is less in evidence in the case of the first-mentioned than in that of the other arts; but it is not the primary element. Imitation of nature is only a secondary or incidental aim in these arts, or rather only a means to an end. This end, the true aim of the arts just mentioned, is to produce an æsthetic impression by the presentation of actual or simulated solid objects that appeal to our sense of beauty, and also carry with them intellectual and ethical associations

that necessarily give to the ultimate æsthetic impression a certain intellectual and ethical colour. In sculpture and painting these objects are in great part human beings, the higher animals, and natural scenes and products connected with human life, objects extremely varied and exhibiting very subtle and complex qualities. The artist cannot constitute these without constant reference to actual objects in nature similar to those through which he desires to produce his æsthetic impression, and this necessary *reference to nature* has given rise to the mistaken idea that the direct *imitation of nature* is in and for itself the primary aim of the representative arts. Any level-headed friend of Plato might have emancipated the philosopher from this tyranny of the *μίμησις* theory by taking him into the Parthenon, and asking him what mortal woman the statue of Athene by Pheidias imitated. As a fact, the ideal types created by the Greek sculptors were fashioned after the most careful and prolonged study of nature, but they were born of the intellect and the imagination and not really *imitated* from anything to be seen in the visible world.

So, too, with Architecture. The architectural monument appeals to the æsthetic sense first through its mass, then through its proportions and the relations of its parts in shape, light and shade, and colour; and also, on the intellectual and ethical side, through the human interest attaching to it as constituted and arranged to serve the needs of the social and religious life of man. Now these primary effects of mass, proportion, light and shade, etc., we have learned to know in nature. Imitation is so far an element in architectural effect that in architecture we receive, as it were, a reminder of natural forms sufficient to touch chords of association in our minds. Architectural masses appeal to our sense of the sublime because in a far-off way they recall to us those aspects of the material creation on which this sense has been nurtured. From the vast spaces of nature, her colossal masses of mountain or cliff, we derive the inspiring, ennobling impression of sublimity, and this same impression we receive from the artistically treated masses and spaces of a great building. The Romans thought the Pantheon was so called because the vast dome of it suggested the vault of heaven, the abode of all the gods, and a similar comparison was made in the case of the cupola of St. Sophia at Constantinople. The effect of a great unbroken mass of masonry a hundred feet or more in height, like the side walls of the Papal Palace at Avignon, reproduces in our mind the impression of the mountain cliff, making up by its sheerness and isolation for its inferiority in measurable size. This intimate relation, in spite of enormous measurable differences, is testified to by Shakespeare in some of the finest lines ever penned by man:

The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself—

words which associate the monument reared by human hands with the vast bulk of the terrestrial mass, the impressiveness of the human production being made more clear and emphatic by composition and treatment.

Grandeur is the noblest of architectural effects, and one reason why, in spite of popular prejudice in favour of painting, architecture may claim supremacy among the arts of form is the fact that in its quality of grandeur it makes a universal appeal. Architecture is the most democratic of the arts. In view of the popularity of the pavement artist, and the attractiveness of the barrel organ, this may seem a paradoxical statement, but the truth is that the fascination of painting and music is something superficial—that is to say, it is only certain showy qualities that are not of the essence of the arts that catch the public eye or ear. For genuine æsthetic appreciation of the effects they produce when at their best an amount of artistic culture is necessary that belongs only to the few. People will say they are fond of pictures, when all they really care for is the presentation of the story or subject. The catchy tune in music makes a universal appeal, but how many really appreciate the æsthetic qualities, say, of a late Beethoven quartette? Whistler said a wicked thing once, that is too anti-democratic in these days to be more than whispered at a quite private gathering, or, if printed, to be set up in any but the smallest type. He was asked to subscribe to a fund for opening the National Gallery to the

working classes on Sundays. He said he would not do this, but would gladly contribute towards their exclusion on weekdays. It was a whimsical way of expressing his fine sense of the honour of his art, which he regarded as stained when its true message was entirely missed.

But of architecture we may fairly claim that it is the best in it that makes the most direct and the widest appeal. Its highest efforts materialise in the great public building. The more public it is, the more numerous, that is to say, are the sections of the people whose lives are affected by it, the more ample will be its proportions the more imposing its mass, and as a consequence the sublime impression it produces will be more forcible and more ennobling. To receive the impression needs only some natural intelligence and an open mind, not any special æsthetic training. There are millions who could be made to feel the awe-inspiring grandeur of the exterior of St. Paul's of London or of the interior of Mr. Bentley's Westminster Cathedral, while one would despair of making any of them appreciate the refined beauty of a Corot landscape. Many of us must have been struck in reading the other day the moving appeal with which Mr. Bevin concluded his presentation of the case of the dockers for an advance in wages. He was pleading on behalf of unskilled labourers not high in the grade of manual workers, but he urged that "Labour had growing aspirations, and cultural development meant as much to it as to the middle and upper classes." If the claim were refused, he said, they "must go to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Education, and tell them to close the schools; tell them that industry can only be run by reducing labour to the pure fodder and animal basis. Teach the people nothing, and let them learn nothing, for to create in their minds aspirations of the love of the beautiful, and at the same time to deny them the wherewithal to satisfy them, was a false policy and a wrong method, and it would be better to keep them in dark ignorance." The phrase "aspirations of the love of the beautiful" is in such a connection a striking one, and one feels that nothing would be more fitted to nourish this aspiration and direct it to the noblest results, than the great architectural monument.

In this sense architecture is the most democratic of the arts, at any rate of the arts of form. It is also democratic in another sense, and this carries us forward to a new set of considerations.

In connection with architecture, especially in the form of the great public building, there is brought about a community in the arts, the results of which alike on the æsthetic and on the social sides are of the most salutary description. Architecture under these conditions becomes in a true sense the "mistress art," presiding over the operations of the so-called decorative or industrial arts, the harmonious co-operation of all involving the wide diffusion of the element of beauty over the community at large. One of the main contentions of this Paper is that the truly artistic epoch is one in which the sense of beauty is so widely diffused that there is an interest and a charm about all the material apparatus of life, so that nothing as a rule is made without it being made at the same time pleasing to the artistic sense. Such an epoch is not necessarily one in which there are great single achievements in the arts of painting and sculpture. Indeed, it may be said that the wide diffusion of art of the homely kind does not, as a rule, correspond in point of time with the production of the independent masterpieces, and these masterpieces have often a baleful effect upon the simpler decorative and industrial work. The true inspiring and guiding influence for these is architecture, and they have flourished best when not painting and sculpture, but architecture was the dominant art.

In support of this contention that the truly artistic epoch is one in which the operations of the arts are all co-ordinated for the task of making the world a place of æsthetic charm and beauty, reference may be made to an address delivered in Edinburgh some thirty years ago by William Morris. The principle for which Morris always contended is, in his own words, that "it is reasonable and right that men should strive to make the useful wares which they produce beautiful just as nature does. . . . To secure art in useful wares, in short, is not frivolity, but a part of the serious business of life." The synonym for this kind of art is architecture, and he goes on to say that "painting is of little use, and sculpture of less, except where their works form a part of architecture" . . . "Archi-

ture," he says, "I look upon first as the foundation of all the arts, and, next, as an all-embracing art." The complete artistic work, the true unit of the (formative) arts, is, he says, "a building with all its due ornament and furniture . . . the dwelling of some group of people, well built, beautiful, suitable for its purpose, and duly ornamented and furnished, so as to express the kind of life which the inmates live. Or it may be some noble and splendid public edifice, built to last for ages, and it also duly ornamented so as to express the life and aspirations of the citizens; in itself a great piece of history embodying their efforts to raise a house worthy of noble lives; its decoration an epic wrought for the pleasure and education not of the present generation only, but of many generations to come. . . . This is," Morris affirms, "the unit of the art, this house, this church, this town-hall, built and ornamented by the harmonious efforts of a free people; by no possibility could one man do it, however gifted he might be" . . . though he may design all the subsidiary work, he cannot execute it . . . "and something of his genius there must be in the other members of the great body that raises the complete work: millions on millions of strokes of hammer and chisel, of the gouge, of the brush, of the shuttle, are embodied in that work of art, and in every one of them there is either intelligence to help the master, or stupidity to foil him. The very masons laying day by day their due tale of rubble and ashlar may help him to fill the souls of all beholders with satisfaction, or may make his paper design a folly or a nullity . . . if they are working backed by intelligent tradition, their work is the expression of their harmonious co-operation . . . so that no one from the master designer downwards could say, This is *my work*, but everyone could say truly, This is *our work*. Try to conceive if you can the mass of pleasure which the production of such a work of art would give to all concerned in making it, through years and years it may be (for such work cannot be hurried), and when made there it is for a perennial pleasure to the citizens, to look at, to use, to care for from day to day and year to year."

"Is this," Morris concludes, "the mere dream of an idealist? No, not at all; such works were once produced . . . in some such way have the famous buildings of the world been raised."

It will be found that the periods when all the arts have worked together to this delightful æsthetic result have *not* been those when sculpture and painting produced independent masterpieces. It is a mistake constantly made to assume that in a great period for the representative arts, such as Greece in the time of Pericles or Alexander and Italy in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, style and treatment in the minor arts must have been on an equally high level. The decoration by Pheidias of the shield of Athene in the statue in the Parthenon is quite faulty in style because it assumes that the shield would never be moved. The surface is treated just as if it were an immovable circular panel, with a figure composition such as a painter would display upon it with a fixed upper and lower limit, whereas a mobile disc like a shield has no top or bottom to it, and should be ornamented in an "all round" fashion. The case of Italian Majolica is a similar one. Here the painter is, as usual at such epochs, the lord of all, and figure pictures with all the effects aimed at in the art are displayed on the circular surfaces of plates, which in their very nature are things to turn and turn about, so that in practice these figures would constantly be seen standing on their heads. The love of the Greeks for representations of the human figure led them to use this motive for the decoration of the rounded surfaces of their vases, where the figures must necessarily be distorted, with parts of them disappearing from view on the receding surfaces. These were mistakes in style due to an abuse of naturalism inevitable when the representative arts are supreme. In point of style Hispano-Mauresque pottery is immeasurably superior to either Italian Majolica or figured Attic vases, for the round dish, with its lustre-glaze and simple, unpretentious ornamental motives disposed in concentric circles or on a radiating scheme, is exactly what decorated pottery should be, the art following its own laws without anything imposed on it from outside by any other art. The Arab craftsman had no pictures or statues about him to put him wrong.

This happy condition of things prevailed generally in the mediæval epoch when the only prominent art was architecture, and it is the secret of what has been justly termed "the unerring mediæval instinct

of style." The spirit of mediæval decorative art is expressed in a remarkable artistic treatise written by a monk's craftsman about the year 1100, known as the *Schedula Diversarum Artium* of the Monk Theophilus. It is perhaps the most interesting book ever written on the subject of the arts of form. It conveys the thoughts of an ecclesiastic vowed to the service of religion in its most ascetic phase, but at the same time all aglow with an enthusiasm for beauty, the inspiration of which he believed came to him from on high. Artistic knowledge and craftsmanship were to him a part of the original heritage of man as he was made in the image of the Great Creative Artist of the Universe, and to win back this heritage by patient labour and contriving was a religious duty, in the fulfilment of which the Holy Spirit would Himself give constant aid. This mediæval monk was a craftsman, interested above all in materials and technical processes, and he cares very little about art as representative. Not only does he ignore completely the "artistic individuality" we hear so much about to-day, but he never talks about nature or the imitation or "treatment" thereof. Symbolism and religious edification lie outside his range of ideas, and he bases everything on workshop practice. In this monastic workshop, whose homely construction and fittings he describes, we are invited to see the gold and silver and bronze, the coloured earths, the glass stained with metallic oxides, all taking shape in dainty or sumptuous forms, and coming together in discreet but opulent display, till, as he phrases it, the Abbey Church which they bedeck and furnish "shall shine like the Garden of Paradise." For to the mind of the pious craftsman this church is a microcosm—a little world in miniature that has been made all glorious within by the creative skill of man—a creative skill, however, that is only his in so far as man shares the nature of the Divine Artist who has fashioned in all its beauty the vast macrocosm of the universe.

To Theophilus the unit of art was the same as it was to William Morris, the great public building, the Abbey Church that was to house, and to express the spiritual life of, a community. Architecture was in this period of the history of North-Western Europe indisputably the "mistress art," and the place of the carver and colourist was one of subordination. At such a period sculpture and painting, as so-called "fine" or "noble" arts—to borrow phrases not older than the Renaissance—have no existence. No carver dreams of setting up his sculptured figure on a pedestal as an independent creation, no limner wrenches his storied panel from its architectural setting to frame it on a wall apart. In such an artistic atmosphere there is not only nothing to prick the artist's individuality into action, but the personal element in the work is hardly existent. The craftsman's individuality is merged in the general artistic activity of the community at large. He has, however, lost his life only to gain a fuller vitality as a factor in a great organised productive energy. At such periods the art of construction has achieved its greatest triumphs, in the sublime mass of the Egyptian pyramid, in the severe proportions of the early Hellenic temple of the sixth century B.C., in Santa Sophia, in a Romanesque abbey church such as Durham, and in the Gothic cathedrals of Central France. These works are the embodiments of the ideals of their own ages. They are not individual inventions, but they incorporate the needs, the aspirations, the faith, of whole communities in forms moulded and perfected by style. The same spirit pervaded the operations of the minor arts. These were all frankly decorative, but the laws which should govern this class of operations were so well observed, so busy within the set limits was the fancy, so just the taste of the craftsman, that, take them all in all, these periods were for the arts that make things beautiful the most flourishing that the world has ever seen.

For such conditions to be realised again in the modern world two or three advantages would have to be secured. The most indispensable of these is perhaps the one which in present circumstances seems least likely to materialise. This is the spirit of disinterested delight on the part of the craftsman in the sort of manual work that produced in old time results so pleasing. There is very little outward sign of this in the modern world of labour, but it does not follow that it might not be revived. A master blacksmith, pretty well advanced in life, was explaining once that when he was a young journeyman he and his fellows used to take a real interest in their craft, and to look out for, and take advantage of, any opportunity the material and the process in hand might offer to get a touch of quaintness or

beauty or ornament into their work. He had himself, he said, the same feeling still of the artistic possibilities of hammered iron, but as to the young workmen of the present day—but here let us pause lest a word be dropped to which in the sacred name of Labour exception might be taken.

Another preliminary measure would be to deal with the picture painter in the same honorific but slightly ironical fashion in which Plato proposed to act towards the poets. It should be explained to him quietly, as Plato explained to the bards he wished to exclude from his ideal republic, that he is a person of the very highest qualities, worthy of almost divine honours which he will find people in general only too eager to pay him. He is, however, too fascinating a being to be allowed to cast his dangerous glamour over the humble craftsmen who are to people our new republic of art. Hence we will load him with compliments but ask him to favour us by making his home elsewhere.

Having in this way exorcised the alluring spirits of individuality and naturalism, we would install Architecture on her throne as the "mistress art," and make her the inspiring and guiding influence for all the rest. She would institute in the first place control, making the artists who help her to carry out her noble, her essentially human and democratic task, feel that they are only parts of a great whole, through their relation to which they themselves attain greatness, and schooling them till their work, simple and limited as it may be, achieves the distinction of style. In the next place, architecture would diffuse among all the subsidiary crafts that sense of material and process which was the basis of success in the decorative arts of mediæval times. For if we look back over the history of these industrial arts, we see each phase of them beginning in the workshop, at the forge or the bench, by the potter's wheel, or on the plasterer's platform. A workman fabricates a cottage, a piece of furniture, a utensil, an implement, simply because there is a demand for such a thing. He makes it to fit the use; and as he is familiar with the method of its employment, so he adapts its form and structure to the purposes it will have to serve. So far there is nothing artistic in the operation, but the artist in the man, though he knows it not, is beginning to awake. Let us suppose, for the sake of simplifying matters, that we are dealing with the craftsmen of a mediæval village, and that the demand is for a half-timber cottage for a chantry priest, and new iron hinges for the church door. The technique of the half-timber cottage is itself of interest. We are not, however, concerned with the technique, but only with the manner in which a certain element of art and beauty finds its way into the structure while it is in process of fabrication, so that the maker becomes an artist without thinking of it. The mere process of manufacture, with the use of the two boldly contrasted materials, wood and plaster, results in itself in a pleasing decorative effect, so that there is really no need for any special enrichment, and none such appears in many quaint and charming bits of old half-timber work in different parts of the country. Some ornamentation is, however, very commonly present, and the genesis of it is interesting to trace.

In its simpler forms it is a spontaneous growth out of the structure, or, perhaps, at times is scarcely other than the natural marks of manipulation on a material, rendered a little more emphatic and regular. The craftsman was not influenced by any doctrine about the artistic value of adornment, but he had certain natural instincts that led him to supplement in this way the piecing together of his fabric. To take some obvious instances of this, we may see that every projecting end struck him as a thing not to be cut off and left raw and plain, but to be hewn into some shape that would give pleasure to the eye; every change of direction in a surface seemed to him to need some added feature that should act as a "stop" and accentuate the point of divergence; every large unbroken surface suggested the introduction of some diversifying details in form and colour. What the shape of feature or detail should be depended on the amount of time or fancy the craftsman was able or willing to give to it. The ultimate form was a matter of indifference; the really artistic point in the whole process was the natural, almost inevitable growth of the ornament out of the structure.

Meanwhile, at the other end of the village street, the smith is manipulating his iron bands into the required hinges for the church door. The door is heavy, and the hinge must grip it firmly, and it

will add to the strength of the woodwork if the iron spreads over it so as to form a sort of armature. He begins, perhaps, by merely splitting the width of his iron strip in half, and spreading the two parts outward, so as to broaden the hold upon the woodwork. This spreading is, however, managed in such a way as to satisfy the eye as well as secure the necessary width of attachment. The branching ends of the hinge will certainly be brought round with a sweep that represents a distinct though hardly conscious effort after richness and grace of line. The points of them will need to be nailed down firmly to the door, and for this purpose will be flattened out and pierced in the centre for the bolt. The main strip will also have to be pierced at intervals for attachments to the oaken planks; and if these holes are punched through while the iron is red-hot, the strip will be forced out a little at the sides at each place where they come. From the form thus arrived at, as from a germ, the whole development of the most elaborate of the really good mediæval door-hinges naturally unfolds itself. The subdivision of the material, or the addition to it at intervals, by welding, of corresponding branches; the flattening out of beds where the bolt-heads may conveniently lie; then the evolution from the branches of a beautiful composition of scroll-work covering the timber with a well-balanced scheme of convolutions; the emergence from the mere flattened bed of the distinct form of a lozenge or quatrefoil or rosette—all this artistic play and movement, the result of which is some lovely mediæval door-hinge, like those at Turvey or Leighton in Bedfordshire, represents the gradual growth of the artist in the workman, under the stimulus of the pliant suggestive material that is under his hand. This is how the art of British ironwork grew up—a thing essentially of the hammer and punch and anvil—conditioned throughout, first, by the ever-present considerations of use, and next by the ever-present artistic sense of the manipulator, who works out in the direction of beauty every hint which the material and process afford.

If we could revive this artistic sense in the manipulator—and Mr. Bevin, we must remember, has credited even the docker with a potential love of the beautiful—if we could train him through material and through process, and teach him to look up to architecture as his mistress, we might go far to solve a problem which for three-quarters of a century has baffled the official British mind. The problem has been how to restore among modern civilised peoples the instinct which they have lost for the right handling of materials with a view to decorative effect. This lamentable fact, the death of the old tradition of art in common things, came prominently into view at the Great Exhibition in Hyde Park in 1851. It is remarkable that that Exhibition was held only fifty years after a time when, at the end of the eighteenth century, the tradition of the industrial arts was still a living thing in Western Europe, and yet one may doubt whether, with the exception, of course, of the late Queen Victoria's Jubilee presents, any such collection of horrors in the form of objects exhibiting every conceivable artistic fault was ever brought together in the world. The impression produced by this exposure of artistic incompetence in the minor but most valuable and important arts was in some quarters a strong one, and led to the formation of the Science and Art Department, and the foundation of schools and museums to teach and encourage the decorative and industrial arts. It so happens that the British authorities of the day could dispose of the services of two singularly well-equipped advisers—Gottfried Semper, the author of the famous classic work on *Style in the Technical and Constructive Arts*, and Alfred Stevens, who for application in practice of these principles of style is one of the great artists of the world. Yet for all this the authorities went wrong from the first in regarding ornament as a dead thing, and in treating decorative art as a sort of mysterious entity that can be detached from or joined on to the apparatus of common life just as we choose. No good can come of looking at ornament as if it were a dead thing belonging to the past, or on art as an independent thing to be used or let alone at will. Whatever ornament and art are, or ought to be, they should not be looked upon as "historic" or "applied." Ornament, which, as we have just seen, should be something fresh and growing, springing almost unbidden into life, in as intimate relation to structure as the flower to the plant, when it becomes "historic" is just a dried and pressed botanical specimen, classified and inventoried, and kept.

nicely gummed at the back, between the covers of Owen Jones's *Grammar of Ornament*, till it can be stuck on to some object that it is naïvely intended to turn in this way from a work of utility to one of art. The community at large was to be treated in similar fashion, and "art" was to be "applied" to it as a sort of mustard plaster that would produce a pleasant titillation in the epidermis of the victim. The museums that were founded and stocked were too miscellaneous in their contents and presented too many examples faulty in style to effect much in the improvement of taste, while the fact that the schools taught painting and sculpture in their advanced forms tended to foster in the students of design false ideals. Whereas style in the decorative and industrial arts is only to be secured on the condition of subordination of the part to the whole, the instinct of the picture painter is to assert in the most uncompromising way his absolute independence. He claims for his work that it is in itself the whole—the only thing that matters. He has no idea of subjecting his design to any conditions outside itself. Furthermore, in painting and sculpture as practised in the modern spirit, the watchword is "nature," and naturalism may be almost described as the poison of decorative art. The only chance for a genuine revival of style in decoration is to separate schools where are taught painting and sculpture, as represented in our periodical exhibitions, from schools which aim at sound instruction in the decorative and industrial arts, and to place these latter schools under the control of architecture recognised in this sense as pre-eminently the Mistress Art.

Both in London and in Edinburgh this might have been easily accomplished. Architecture is, of course, officially recognised by the Royal Academy at Burlington House, and officially taught in its schools. To what extent the architectural department in these schools has been a success we need not inquire, but the views of one who for many years knew it better than anyone else were never very optimistic. By the side of her showy sisters, Painting and Sculpture, there is something almost Cinderella-like in the position there of the art the claim of which to magistral rank has been urged in this paper. When the School of Design was formed at South Kensington, it would have been a move of great promise to set architecture there in the midst of the operations of the subsidiary arts which it would inspire and guide. Something like the community of the arts of which William Morris had a vision might have been secured.

In Edinburgh there was a better chance still of effecting such a reform, because the whole question of artistic education in the Scottish capital came up for review a decade or so ago. Here there was an established school of painting and sculpture under the Royal Scottish Academy, that had fine traditions at its back, and was doing admirable work in fostering those qualities in Scottish art that had given it its distinctive position in the artistic world. There was also a newly founded architectural school that, being necessarily without traditions, could have taken any place assigned to it in a well-balanced comprehensive scheme. It would have been a bold step, and one which the responsible authorities were too cautious to take, to supply the Royal Scottish Academy with proper funds and appliances for carrying on and extending, perhaps by provincial schools, its excellent and thoroughly national work on its own traditional lines, but to keep it quite apart from the newly constituted school of design, which should not embrace within its scope the forms of art on which the Royal Scottish Academy had specialised. Of the new school Architecture should have been the recognised head, presiding over all those operations of the so-called decorative and industrial arts that would combine to make the objects that compose our surroundings things of beauty and interest. The opportunity was a very favourable one; but it was lost, it is to be feared, beyond recall. Without some fundamental reform of the kind, it is difficult to see how the problem referred to above can ever be satisfactorily solved.



PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT AND PRACTICE.

Members are aware that the Council have from time to time passed Resolutions with a view to indicating the proper professional practice to be followed in specific cases, and in the President's "Message" of July last, published by order of the Council in the JOURNAL of August last, occurs the following paragraph:—

"It has long been in my mind that a definite Code of Professional Conduct would be very helpful to our younger, perhaps to all our members. Such a Code, drawn up by Guadet on behalf of the Société Centrale des Architectes Français in 1895, has been adopted by every Society of Architects in France; and a draft on similar lines will be laid before you for approval in due course."

Such a draft was duly prepared, and circulated to the Allied Societies and Standing Committees for their observations thereon. It has been most favourably received by the Profession; the suggestions made for amplification or amendment have been helpful, and for the most part have been adopted by the Council. With regard to the payment of fees for Quantities by the Contractor instead of directly by the Employer, representations have been made by five Allied Societies that this practice is followed, in the areas they administer, by architects of unblemished reputation; the Council have therefore slightly modified the original draft to meet these cases. But they remind members that this procedure is not in accordance with the best practice, and that a Resolution on the subject has appeared in the KALENDAR (p. 60) for some twelve years past. They therefore trust that the Councils of Allied Societies in whose districts the custom still prevails will do their best to discourage and abolish it, since it is very undesirable that monetary relations of any kind should exist between architects and the contractors they control on their clients' behalf.

Save for the foregoing objection, and some minor criticisms which are nearly all met by the draft now submitted, the document has been generally approved.

The Council have approved the document as amended and printed below, and have ordered it to be printed in the KALENDAR in place of the Resolutions on Professional Conduct on page 60.

PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT AND PRACTICE.

In order to place on record the considerations which govern the conduct of honourable Architects and the customs accepted and observed by the Architectural Profession, the Council of the Royal Institute of British Architects declares the practice of Architects to be as follows:—

I.

PERSONAL AND INTER-PROFESSIONAL OBLIGATIONS.

1. The Architect is both an artist and a technician. He designs the construction, the internal and external proportions, arrangements, decoration and accessories of buildings, directs their execution and regulates the expenditure upon them.

2. The profession of Architecture is liberal and uncommercial. It is incompatible with the business of a Contractor, Manufacturer, dealer in (or agent for) materials used in buildings, or of an Auctioneer or House Agent.

3. An Architect is remunerated solely by his fees, and is debarred from any other source of profit in connection with the works and duties entrusted to him.

4. An Architect who owns, or has a commercial interest in, any material, device or invention used in building informs his client thereof and obtains his sanction before permitting it to be used in works executed under his direction.

5. An Architect does not act as a tradesman or

broker; and accepts no business which involves his giving or receiving discounts or commissions.

6. An Architect does not publicly advertise, nor offer his services, by means of circulars or other means of publicity employed in trade and commerce. But he may publish illustrations or descriptions of his work, since these contribute to the common fund of knowledge. He may exhibit his name on buildings in course of execution (providing it is done in an unostentatious manner) and may sign them when completed in a way similar to that adopted by sculptors of repute.

7. An Architect declines to obtain work or clients by means of presents, commissions, reductions of his fees, or inducements to agents and subordinates. He refuses all secret dealings with regard to a client or a prospective client.

8. He abstains from seeking in any way the clients of another architect or the appointments held by him. Should he be called upon to accept such clients or appointments by reason of the death, retirement, or rightful termination of the employment of another architect, he considers himself the guardian of the honour and interests of his predecessor.

9. An Architect recognises the professional standing of his brother architects, and admits the right to that title of all who honourably exercise the profession. He is careful to observe towards them the courteous consideration due from one artist to another.

10. The copyright of an architect's design is the

property of the author, and is scrupulously respected by other architects. His knowledge and experience should nevertheless be always at the service of his profession.

11. When an architect employs other architects as draughtsmen or assistants he gives them his aid and counsel and treats them with the consideration proper to members of the profession.

II.

OBLIGATIONS TOWARDS CLIENTS.

12. The architect devotes his whole ability to protecting the just interests of his clients. He uses all his knowledge, skill, and experience in designing the buildings entrusted to him, directing their execution, regulating the expenditure upon them, and giving his opinion and advice.

13. But he does not lend himself, even at his clients' request, to proceedings calculated to infringe the rights of others, nor undertake operations which appear to him likely to injure his reputation, to compromise others, or to lead to accidents. In such cases he intimates to his clients that he finds himself unable to carry out their instructions.

14. He also notifies his clients when their alterations to proposed works are likely to increase the cost thereof.

15. An Architect is remunerated by his clients (and by them alone) by means of fees, under the Conditions of Engagement stated in the Scale of Professional Charges authorised by the Royal Institute of British Architects. He accepts no remuneration or payment of any kind whatever from builders, merchants and buyers or vendors of land or property, under contract with his clients unless with their full knowledge and approval.*

16. In connection with current repairs, administration, and other matters in which charges are made for time and services rendered, the architect usually delivers to his clients periodical accounts of his fees. For new works, and for important alterations to or renovations of existing buildings, he receives interim payments on account of his fees as laid down in the Scale of Professional Charges above mentioned.

17. An Architect declines judicial functions in a case in which he has already expressed an opinion on the subject of the dispute. When he is nominated as an Assessor or Arbitrator he ceases to represent his clients, and acts impartially.

III.

OBLIGATIONS TOWARDS CONTRACTORS AND OPERATIVES.

18. An Architect exerts his personal influence to establish harmony, cordiality and good faith between all those engaged upon his works. In so far as is compatible with his duty to his clients, he endeavours to save expense to the Contractors and labour to the

operatives, encourages them to take an interest in the work, and receives with courtesy their technical suggestions for its improvement.

19. An Architect interprets the conditions of a Contract with impartial fairness as between his client and the Contractor. He supplies the Contractor with clear instructions, and informs him of his intentions by means of drawings, or otherwise, at as early a stage of the works as possible in order that the Contractor may make favourable arrangements for their execution.

20. An Architect does not permit the insertion of any clause in tenders, bills of quantities, or other contract documents which provides for payment to be made to him by the Contractor, whatever may be the consideration, unless with the full knowledge and approval of his client.

21. An Architect does not accept any discount, gift, or business commission from contractors and tradesmen, whether employed upon his works or not.

22. Unless specially so requested by his clients, he does not undertake the payment of contractors.

23. Should an Architect have occasion to reprove a contractor or foreman, he does so in such a way as not to impair their authority with the operatives.

INCREASE OF ENTRANCE FEES AND SUBSCRIPTIONS: PRIVY COUNCIL'S SANCTION.

AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, WHITEHALL,
the 21st day of June, 1920.

By the Lords of His Majesty's Most Honourable
Privy Council.

WHEREAS the Royal Institute of British Architects did, in accordance with the provisions of the 33rd Article of the Charter of Incorporation of the said Institute, by Resolution passed at a Special General Meeting of the said Institute held on the 10th day of May, 1920, and confirmed at a subsequent Special General Meeting of the said Institute held on the 7th day of June, 1920, resolve:—

"That in order to provide funds to meet the increase in expenditure due to the general advance in prices an addition of one guinea be made to all entrance fees and subscriptions of Members and contributions of Licentiates, and that the necessary steps be taken to obtain the sanction of the Privy Council to such revision of Bye-law 17 as is required to give effect to this Resolution."

And whereas by the said 33rd Article it is provided that no Bye-laws shall be of any force or validity whatever unless and until they have been approved by the Lords of the Council.

And whereas a revised Bye-law in substitution for Bye-law 17 has been submitted to the Lords of the Council.

NOW, THEREFORE, Their Lordships, having taken the said revised Bye-law (a copy whereof is here-

* In certain districts it is an admitted practice for Architects who take out the quantities themselves to be paid for them through the builder.

unto annexed) into consideration, are pleased to allow the same. ALMERIC FITZROY.

REVISED BYE-LAW REFERRED TO IN THE FOREGOING ORDER OF COUNCIL.

Bye-law 17.

The amounts of entrance fees and subscriptions shall be from time to time determined by Resolution of the Royal Institute.

- (a) The entrance fee of each Fellow shall not exceed six guineas, nor his annual subscription five guineas. In the case of a Fellow elected from the Class of Associates, his entrance fee shall not exceed three guineas. Provided always that the Council may during their pleasure dispense with the payment of an entrance fee in the case of Non-Metropolitan Fellows.
- (b) The entrance fee of each Associate shall not exceed four guineas, nor his annual subscription three guineas.
- (c) The entrance fee of each Honorary Associate shall be at least three guineas, which shall be appropriated to the Library fund, and his annual subscription shall be three guineas.
- (d) A Licentiate shall pay an annual contribution of two guineas and for this shall be entitled (1) to receive the Journal and Kalendar of the Royal Institute; (2) to use the Institute premises, subject to any regulations or restrictions that the Council may make from time to time.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COUNCIL.

Monday, 5th July, 1920.

MODEL PUBLIC HOUSE COMPETITION.—The President announced that the Court of the Brewers' Company had presented to the Royal Institute a sum of £500 to be devoted to the payment of premiums in a competition for the design of a Model Public House. The President has consented to act as Hon. Assessor.

THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION.—The Council have approved of the formation of a Committee of the Board, confined to teachers, for the consideration of internal school subjects.

EXEMPTION FROM THE FINAL EXAMINATION.—On the recommendation of the Board, the Council have granted exemption from the Final Examination (subject to the limitations and conditions previously announced) to the successful students who have taken a five years' Diploma or Degree course at the Architectural Association, London, and the School of Architecture, Liverpool University.

THE PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION.—The Council have approved of the holding of Entrance Examinations in Drawing and Geometry at the "Recognised Schools" and will accept a pass in these Examinations as exempting from the Preliminary Examination of the R.I.B.A.

THE INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATION.—Exemption from the Intermediate Examination is to be limited to students of "Recognised Schools" who have passed through a full time three years' course. Written examinations in the History of Architecture and in Building Construction are to be part of the course in all "Recognised Schools" for exemption from the Intermediate Examination.

ANNUAL EXHIBITIONS OF SCHOOL DESIGN WORK.—All schools "recognised" for exemption from the Intermediate and Final Examinations are to submit annually for exhibition at the R.I.B.A. (a) four designs (one showing construction) from each of the students who are passed by the school for the Final Examination in the previous Session, and (b) one design from each of the students passed for the Intermediate Examination.

GOVERNMENT RESTRICTIONS ON BUILDING.—The Stoppage of Building Committee is pursuing its enquiry into the effects of the recent restrictions on building, and, with the approval of the Council, is inviting kindred societies and the representatives of business interests affected to appoint members to serve on the Committee with a view to organising a public protest against the restrictive legislation which is hampering the industry.

THE OTTAWA GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS COMPETITION.—The Council decided to brief counsel to appear at Ottawa in the action brought against the Canadian Government by the competitors in the first competition held in 1914.

INCREASE OF ENTRANCE FEES AND SUBSCRIPTIONS.—The Council received an intimation that the Privy Council had sanctioned the amendment of the bye-laws to permit an increase in entrance fees and subscriptions.

WESTMINSTER ABBEY FUND.—The Council voted a contribution of 100 guineas to the fund for the repair of Westminster Abbey.

Masters of Recognised Schools and Private Practice.

The Council, on the recommendation of the Board of Architectural Education, have passed the following resolution: That no Professor or Master of a "Recognised" School should be debarred from general practice.

The R.I.B.A. Model Form of Contract.

The Form of Agreement and Schedule of Conditions for Building Contracts, which with some slight modification has been in use since 1903, has been revised by a Committee of the Institute with the assistance of their legal advisers, and the revised document, entitled "Model Form of Agreement and Schedule of Conditions for Building Contracts," is now published and on sale at the Institute at the price of 1s. 6d. per copy. This revision has been drawn up to meet modern conditions and as a model to be submitted to the client's solicitors. The form will be known by its short title, "The Model Form of Contract."

STATE-AIDED HOUSING SCHEMES: REVISED SCALES OF ARCHITECTS' AND QUANTITY SURVEYORS' FEES.

As a result of lengthy negotiations between representatives of the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, the Scottish Board of Health, the Royal Institute of British Architects, the Institute of Scottish Architects, and the Society of Architects a revised scale of charges for Housing schemes has now been agreed upon and issued. The final negotiations on behalf of the architectural bodies were conducted by Mr. J. S. Gibson [F.] and Sir Charles Ruthen [F.], Vice-President of the Society of Architects. The following letters, exchanged between Mr. E. R. Forber, acting for the Ministry of Health, and Sir Charles Ruthen, acting for the architectural bodies, explain the final stage of the negotiations and contain important qualifying provisions agreed to by both parties:—

Ministry of Health, 22nd July 1920.

DEAR SIR CHARLES RUTHEN,—With reference to the conference you had this morning with the Accountant-General and myself regarding the point reserved in the Memorandum as to Architects' fees, we agreed as follows:

1. Where it is proposed by a Local Authority or Public Utility Society to employ a single architect for over 250 houses the Ministry are to be consulted before any arrangements as to fees are made.

2. Up to 500 houses the Ministry will agree that the scale as it stands will apply.

3. For schemes containing more than 500 houses the Ministry will consider each case on its merits, but before giving a decision they will consult the Royal Institute of British Architects and the Society of Architects.

I shall be glad to hear that you agree that this correctly represents the conclusions at which we arrived.—Yours sincerely,

E. R. FORBER.

*H.M. Office of Works, Westminster, S.W.1.
24th July 1920.*

DEAR MR. FORBER,—I have your letter of the 22nd inst., and agree that the points reserved in the Memorandum as to Architects' fees were settled at the conference I had at the Ministry with yourself and the Accountant-General on the morning of the 22nd inst. in the manner set out in detail in your letter, that is to say:—

1. Where it is proposed by a Local Authority or Public Utility Society to employ a single architect for over 250 houses the Ministry are to be consulted before any arrangements as to fees are made.

2. Up to 500 houses the Ministry will agree that the scale as it stands will apply.

3. For schemes containing more than 500 houses the Ministry will consider each case on its merits, but before giving a decision they will consult the Royal Institute of British Architects and the Society of Architects.

It is, of course, agreed that the term "single architect" shall mean a single architect or firm of architects, and that the scale as published stands for any number of houses, where more than one architect or firm of architects is employed.

Mr. James S. Gibson, F.R.I.B.A., concurs in this agreement, and I am pleased to know that this very difficult matter has been so amicably settled.

I have communicated the above settlement to the

Secretary of the Royal Institute and the Secretary of the Society of Architects.—I am, yours sincerely,

E. R. FORBER, Esq.,
The Ministry of Health.

CHARLES T. RUTHEN.

The Revised Scales are set out as follows in the General Housing Memorandum No. 31, dated from the Ministry of Health 8th July 1920:—

Fees payable to Architects and Quantity Surveyors in connection with State-aided Housing Schemes.

REVISED SCALES AND CONDITIONS.

The Minister of Health has had under consideration the question of the fees payable to Architects and Quantity Surveyors in private practice for professional work in connection with State-aided housing schemes, and has decided that the scales of fees and the arrangements laid down in General Housing Memorandum No. 4, issued in September, 1919, shall be revised in certain respects. The revised scales are set out below, and have been framed on the assumption that properly qualified members of the respective professions will be employed.

No charge will be allowed in the Housing Assisted Scheme Accounts in respect of the preparation of schemes which are not approved by the Ministry of Health.

The revised scales of fees and conditions are to apply to all State-aided housing schemes where a contract for the constructional work has not been let at the date of this memorandum.

The scales will apply to every scheme, although two or more architects may be employed. In any case, however, of a scheme for over 250 houses in which the local authority or public utility society proposes to employ a single architect or firm of architects, the Ministry should be consulted before any arrangements as to fees are made.

Save in exceptional circumstances, it is not desirable that any one architect or firm of architects should be entrusted with more than 250 houses in any one scheme.

The scales of fees cover the ordinary variations in type of house and such modifications as are made to avoid monotony in appearance, and are intended to include all necessary duties of an architect and surveyor incidental to the carrying out of the work, including such duties as are involved in complying with the requirements of the Ministry of Health.

The conditions of engagements of architects and surveyors shall be those which are customary in the respective professions; for example, generally, such as the conditions prescribed by The Royal Institute of British Architects and The Society of Architects, in the case of the engagement of architects.

REVISED SCALES OF FEES.

I.—ARCHITECTS.

A.—Preparation of Lay-out Plans.

For the preparation of a plan or scheme from existing maps, showing roads, builders' plots and buildings in block, including:—

- (1) Conferences with local authorities and their officials;
- (2) Surveying, levelling, and preparation of contour plan;
- (3) Lay-out plan (where necessary) to 1/2,500 scale;
- (4) Detailed lay-out plan or plans to 1/500 scale; but exclusive of the preparation of detailed plans of buildings:—

For 25 houses	£1 per house
For a further 75 houses	10s. "
For the remainder	7s. 6d. "

In cases where the number of houses has not been determined, the fees shall be based on an average of 10 houses per acre.

Where a fully contoured plan of the site is provided by the local authority, a deduction shall be made in respect thereof, from the fees above stated, of £1 per acre.

B.—Roads and Sewers.

For preparing working drawings, specifications and

quantities for roads and sewers in accordance with the layout plans prepared under Section A, advising on the same and on the preparation of contract, furnishing to the contractor one copy of the drawings, specifications and quantities, general supervision, issuing certificates, measuring up, passing and certifying the accounts :—

For 25 houses	£2 per house
For a further 75 houses	£1 "
For the remainder	15s. "

C.—Cottages and Flats.

For taking instructions, preparing sketch designs, making approximate estimate of cost, preparing drawings and specifications, obtaining tenders, advising on tenders and on preparation of contract, selecting and instructing consultants, furnishing to the Contractor one copy of the drawings and specifications, and such other details as are necessary for the proper carrying out of the works, general supervision, issuing certificates for payments, and passing and certifying accounts :—

- (a) For schemes comprising any number of houses up to 250 :—

5 per cent. upon 12 cottages or flats.	
$2\frac{1}{2}$ " " a further 60 cottages or flats.	
$1\frac{1}{2}$ " " " 178 " "	

- (b) For schemes comprising 251 to 500 houses :—

5 per cent. upon 12 cottages or flats.	
$2\frac{1}{2}$ " " a further 60 cottages or flats.	
$1\frac{1}{2}$ " " " 178 " "	

Upon a further 250 cottages or flats, the percentage stated in (a) less $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

- (c) For schemes comprising 501 to 750 houses :—

5 per cent. upon 12 cottages or flats.	
$2\frac{1}{2}$ " " a further 60 cottages or flats.	
$1\frac{1}{2}$ " " " 178 " "	

Upon 250 to 500 cottages or flats, the percentages stated in (a) less $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Upon 501 to 750 cottages or flats, the percentages stated in (a) less 15 per cent.

- (d) For schemes comprising 751 to 1,000 houses :—

5 per cent. upon 12 cottages or flats.	
$2\frac{1}{2}$ " " a further 60 cottages or flats.	
$1\frac{1}{2}$ " " " 178 " "	

Upon 251 to 500 cottages or flats, the percentages stated in (a) less $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Upon 501 to 750 cottages or flats, the percentages stated in (a) less 15 per cent.

Upon 751 to 1,000 cottages or flats, the percentages stated in (a) less 20 per cent.

- (e) For schemes comprising over 1,000 houses :—

5 per cent. upon 12 cottages or flats.	
$2\frac{1}{2}$ " " a further 60 cottages or flats.	
$1\frac{1}{2}$ " " " 178 " "	

Upon 251 to 500 cottages or flats, the percentages stated in (a) less $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Upon 501 to 750 cottages or flats, the percentages stated in (a) less 15 per cent.

Upon 751 to 1,000 cottages or flats, the percentages stated in (a) less 20 per cent.

Upon the remainder, the percentages stated in (a) less 25 per cent.

Limitation of Amounts upon which Full Scale Fees may be charged.

The maximum amounts upon which full scale fees in respect of cottages or flats may be charged are as follows :—

Type of Cottage or Flat.	Maximum amount.
A2.—Non-parlour with 2 bedrooms ..	£750
A3.—Non-parlour with 3 bedrooms ..	850
B3.—Parlour with 3 bedrooms ..	950
B4.—Parlour with 4 bedrooms ..	1,050

Where the actual cost exceeds the above maximum amounts, the fees payable on the excess above the maxi-

mum shall not exceed one-third of the ordinary scale fees applicable in the particular case.

In all cases comprising one scheme, but where the houses are situated on different and distinct sites some distance apart and requiring separate supervision, the architect may charge in addition to the fees set out above, and subject to the limitation of the amounts on which full scale fees may be charged, one-half per cent. on the cost of each house erected on any such sites containing not more than 12 houses.

Method of Calculating Fees.

For the purpose of arriving at the cost upon which the fees are to be calculated, the average cost of the houses over the whole scheme is to be taken. In determining the average, the cost to be taken into account in respect of any particular type of cottage or flat shall not exceed the maximum amount for that type stated above plus one-third of any amount by which the cost may exceed that maximum.

II.—QUANTITY SURVEYORS.

(a) For the preparation of bills of quantities in respect of each separate site or scheme, the charge to be based upon the amount of the accepted tender, or, where no tender is accepted, upon the estimated cost of the work, subject in either case to the limitation hereinafter mentioned :—

2 per cent. upon 12 cottages or flats.	
1 " " a further 60 cottages or flats.	
$\frac{1}{2}$ " " " 178 " "	
$\frac{1}{4}$ " " " 250 " "	
$\frac{1}{8}$ " " " remainder.	

Site and drainage work to be regarded as appurtenances of the buildings.

Limitation of Amounts upon which Full Scale Fees may be charged.

The maximum amounts upon which full scale fees in respect of cottages or flats may be charged are as follows :—

Type of Cottage or Flat.	Maximum amount
A2.—Non-parlour with 2 bedrooms ..	£750
A3.—Non-parlour with 3 bedrooms ..	850
B3.—Parlour with 3 bedrooms ..	950
B4.—Parlour with 4 bedrooms ..	1,050

Where the actual cost exceeds the above maximum amounts, the fees payable on the excess above the maximum shall not exceed one-third of the ordinary scale fees applicable in the particular case.

Method of Calculating Fees.

For the purpose of arriving at the cost upon which the fees are to be calculated, the average cost of the houses over the whole scheme is to be taken. In determining the average, the cost to be taken into account in respect of any particular type of cottage or flat shall not exceed the maximum amount for that type stated above plus one-third of any amount by which the cost may exceed that maximum.

In the case of any scheme for more than 2,000 houses where a single surveyor (or firm of surveyors) is employed, the local authority or public utility society carrying out the scheme should make a special agreement as to fees with the surveyor, subject to the approval of the Minister of Health.

(b) 2 per cent. in respect of administrative blocks and other unit (non-repeat) buildings such as laundries, repair workshops, etc.

- (c) For alterations to and conversion of old buildings :—

$2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. where the accepted tender or the estimated cost does not exceed £5,000.	
2 per cent. where the accepted tender or the estimated cost exceeds £5,000.	

- (d) Measuring and making up account of variations consequent upon alterations in design including foundations :—

$1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. upon gross amount of additions.	
1 " " omissions.	

- (e) Adjusting contract price consequent upon changes in

cost of labour and checking and considering claims in respect thereof:—

1½ per cent. upon the net amount of additions.

(f) Adjusting contract price consequent upon changes in cost of materials and checking and considering claims in respect thereof:—

Where this work is done by the surveyor, a special fee is to be arranged, not to exceed ½ per cent. in respect of the first 100 houses upon the gross cost of the materials dealt with, and ¼ per cent. in respect of any number of houses beyond the first 100 upon the gross cost of the materials dealt with. In the event of any difference as to the amount to be charged for this work, the difference is to be determined by the Minister of Health, whose decision shall be final.

(g) For pricing out Bills of Quantities, a special fee is to be arranged, and in the event of any difference as to the amount to be charged for this work, the difference is to be determined by the Minister of Health, whose decision shall be final.

The above scales of fees for Quantity Surveyors do not cover the making of calculations and preparation of statements for the purpose of issuing certificates, and are exclusive of all disbursements in respect of printing, lithography, and other out-of-pocket expenses.

THE UNIFICATION COMMITTEE.

Minutes of the Meeting held Tuesday, 20th July, 1920,
2.30-4.20 p.m.*

Present:

Mr. John W. Simpson, President R.I.B.A., in the Chair.
PAST PRESIDENTS R.I.B.A.

Sir Aston Webb, P.R.A., K.C.V.O., C.B.
Sir Reginald Blomfield, R.A., Litt.D.

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE R.I.B.A.

Fellows: Sir Banister Fletcher, Mr. A. W. S. Cross,
Mr. Arthur Keen, Mr. E. Stanley Hall, Major
Harry Barnes, M.P.

Associates: Mr. Horace Cubitt, Mr. Herbert A.
Welch, Mr. K. Gammell, Mr. W. R. Davidge, Mr.
Digby L. Solomon, Mr. G. Leonard Elkington,
Mr. F. W. Hubbard.

Licentiate: Mr. H. Ascroft, Mr. H. R. Bird, Mr.
A. J. Penty, Mr. Francis R. Taylor, Mr. J. E.
Yerbury.

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ALLIED SOCIETIES IN THE
UNITED KINGDOM.

Bristol Soc. of Architects:—Mr. G. C. Lawrence [A].
Devon and Exeter Architectural Society:—Mr.
Lewis Tonar [Licentiate].

Dundee Institute of Architects:—Mr. A. G. Heiton.
Edinburgh Architectural Association:—Mr. W. T.
Oldrieve [F].

Glasgow Institute of Architects:—Mr. Wm. B.
Whitie [F].

Hampshire and Isle of Wight Association of Archi-
tects:—Mr. J. B. Healing [A].

Leeds and West Yorkshire Architectural Society:—
Mr. W. Carby Hall [F].

Leicester and Leicestershire Society of Architects:—
Mr. A. H. Hind [F].

Liverpool Architectural Society:—Mr. T. Taliesin
Rees [F].

Manchester Society of Architects:—Mr. A. W.
Hennings [F].

Northern Architectural Association:—Mr. C. S.
Errington [F].

Sheffield, South Yorkshire and District Architectural
Society:—Mr. C. B. Flockton [F].

South Wales Institute of Architects:—Mr. Ivor
Jones [A].

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ALLIED SOCIETIES IN THE
DOMINIONS.—Australia:—Major H. C. Corlette,
O.B.E., R.B.C. [F].

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ARCHITECTURAL ASSOCIATION
(LONDON).—Mr. Maurice E. Webb, D.S.O., M.C. [F].

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS.—
Mr. Edwin J. Sadgrove [F], Sir Charles T. Ruthen,
O.B.E. [F], Mr. A. Burnett Brown, Mr. George H.
Paine, Mr. Noel D. Sheffield, Mr. Edwin J. Partridge,
Mr. C. McArthur Butler.

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ARCHITECTS' AND SURVEYORS'
ASSISTANTS' PROFESSIONAL UNION.—Mr. R. G.
Llewellyn-Evans.

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE OFFICIAL ARCHITECTS' ASSOCIA-
TION.—Mr. Sydney Perks, F.S.A. [F].

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ULSTER SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS.
—Mr. N. Fitzsimons [F].

REPRESENTATIVES OF ARCHITECTS UNATTACHED TO ANY
PROFESSIONAL ORGANISATION.—Mr. G. E. Marshall
(Liverpool), and Mr. A. H. Mooring Aldridge (Bourne-
mouth).

Ian MacAlister, Secretary R.I.B.A.

Appointment of Vice-Chairman.—On the motion of
Major Harry Barnes, M.P., it was RESOLVED—That Mr.
E. J. Sadgrove, President of the Society of Architects, be
appointed Vice-Chairman.

Appointment of Hon. Secretary.—On the motion of Mr.
Maurice E. Webb, it was RESOLVED—That Mr. Arthur
Keen, Hon. Secretary R.I.B.A., be appointed Hon. Secre-
tary of the Committee.

Appointment of Sub-Committee.—On the motion of Mr.
Sydney Perks, it was unanimously RESOLVED—That the
following members be appointed to serve on the Sub-
Committee:—

The Chairman.

The Vice-Chairman.

The Hon. Secretary.

Sir Banister Fletcher [F].

Mr. James S. Gibson [F].

Major Harry Barnes, M.P. [F].

Mr. Herbert A. Welch [A].

Mr. Horace Cubitt [A].

Mr. G. Leonard Elkington [A].

Mr. J. E. Yerbury [Licentiate].

Sir Charles Ruthen [F].

Mr. Noel Sheffield.

Mr. C. McArthur Butler.

Mr. Maurice E. Webb [F], representing the Archi-
tectural Association.

Mr. W. E. Riley [F], representing the Official Archi-
tects' Association.

Mr. R. G. Llewellyn-Evans, representing Architects'
and Surveyors' Assistants' Professional Union.

Mr. W. B. Whitie [F], representing the Institute of
Scottish Architects.

Mr. H. T. Buckland [F], representing the Allied
Societies.

Mr. G. E. Marshall, representing the Unattached
Architects.

The Work of the Committee.—The Chairman then out-
lined the work that lay before the Committee, and sug-
gested that the Sub-Committee be instructed to prepare
alternative schemes of unification for consideration. After
some discussion it was finally RESOLVED, on the motion of
Major Harry Barnes, M.P., seconded by Major H. C. Cor-
lette, by a unanimous vote, that it be an instruction to the
Sub-Committee to draft and submit to the Grand Com-
mittee alternative proposals for unification based re-
spectively on absorption and federation.

* A full report of the Debate will be given in the August number
of the JOURNAL.

TEMPLE MOORE.

TEMPLE LUSHINGTON MOORE, elder son of the late Major-General G. F. Moore, was always delicate from his childhood upwards. In his early boyhood he determined to become an artist, and so zealously did he pursue the idea that by the time he had reached the early teens he had made a sufficient number of sketches, mostly in water colours, to cover the walls of his house. Eventually, however, he decided to become an architect, and was articled to my father, the late George Gilbert Scott.

During his pupilage, and the early days following it, he was a most enthusiastic and hardworking student of ancient work, of which he acquired an exhaustive knowledge both in Great Britain and on the Continent. At the same time he made an enormous number of measured drawings. These drawings were almost invariably done in his characteristic style, on 14 in. by 10 in. sketching blocks, using a small tee and set squares and a two-foot rule. A scale-rule he never used at any time in his life—no matter to what scale he was drawing. He usually finished these drawings in colours, and three such drawings per diem was the rate at which he made them. He always *drew* with his left hand, but he might be said to have been ambidextrous, for he *wrote* with his right hand. But he had no opinion of his own draughtsmanship, and used to say that he thought he could *design*, but he certainly could not *draw*. However, in spite of this fancied disability, he would make large and important perspective drawings without any geometrical "setting up" whatever, and they always looked correct.

Temple Moore's ability for solving constructional difficulties was quite remarkable, and his resourcefulness was not less so. If an unforeseen difficulty arose in the carrying out of the work, or a suggestion was made that some part or arrangement he had proposed was not satisfactory, he would readily propose not one, but many, alternatives.

Another characteristic ability was that of being able to judge the dimensions of an existing building, and the sizes of its parts and scantlings. When called in to advise on new or restoration work to a building, he would make complete sketch plans, sections and details of the existing work, figuring in dimensions of heights and sizes, without any measuring to speak of; and when, later, his work was checked by measurement, it was found to be surprisingly accurate.

In spite of his most conservative character and intense love and reverence for ancient work, he was anxious not merely to continue on the same lines as his immediate predecessors of the Bodley School, but to carry on still further the development of the revived Gothic style. He himself always fancied that he failed to make the advance he strove for; but that he was unjust to himself in this respect will be readily admitted by all who know his work well. St. Peter's, Barnsley, and a host of smaller churches readily occur

to one; in fact, it is difficult to think of any that are not very distinctively Temple Moore's.

No man that I ever knew was so wholly absorbed by and devoted to his art as Temple Moore. So absent-minded did this make him that he has been known to leave clients' houses without recollecting to take leave of them.

An extremely shy man, he always worked at his home at Hampstead, and was probably not known, even by sight, to very many of his admirers. As an instance of his shyness, I remember a little incident that occurred while I was articled to him. I was working at home in my spare time on the Liverpool Cathedral competition drawings, and in consequence was often late in arriving at the office, and early in leaving. Temple Moore endured my irregular hours for weeks before venturing on a reprimand, and when he finally summoned up his courage to remind me that office hours were from 10 to 5, he did so, not verbally, but by sending me a post card to that effect!

Unfortunately for him, he had no hobby of any kind outside his work. Under the persuasion of his friends he tried several during his early manhood, but nothing of the sort appealed to him or in the least interested him, and he never followed them up. He had a wonderful memory—not only for the details of his work, but also for general facts, dates, and names. He would readily recall, for instance, the names of foremen and even principal workmen and others with whom he had been in contact on his many works years before.

Among the many works he carried out during his 40 years of busy practice it is difficult to point to outstanding examples, for the level is so uniformly high, and they all show the distinctiveness of his genius.

The versatility alone shown in his works, when considered in a group, makes it impossible to say that such or such are the greatest of them; but, generally speaking, his cheaper churches possess his own personal touch to a far greater extent than his more costly work, and I feel that in these strong, simple and original buildings is found the true Temple Moore. Emphatically he has left the impress of his genius upon modern ecclesiastical architecture.

G. GILBERT SCOTT [F.].

Mr. LESLIE MOORE [F.] writes:—

Mr. Temple Moore was a great believer in the Catholic Faith and tradition of the Church, travelling much in France, Italy and the British Isles, and making hundreds of sketches of mediæval churches. He was a man who lived for his profession; sketching and measuring old work were his recreations; he had been known to tramp many miles to visit some ancient church to study special features. Gifted with a prodigious memory, he would quote measurements and details of various parts of churches with accuracy that he had not seen for many years.

His sympathetic knowledge of the past found full

scope in the preservation of an ancient building, in which he especially excelled; it was wonderful how he would keep the correct feeling, and seemed to be able to inspire those working with him and for him with the mediæval spirit. Amongst the most interesting examples of such work are St. William's College, York, and Yaxley Church, Hunts.

Of the most beautiful characteristic examples of his original work may be mentioned St. Wilfred's Church, Harrogate, the Pusey House, Oxford, St. Peter's Church, Barnsley, St. Mary's, Sledmere, and a hundred other new churches and additions which will remain a lasting memorial of his greatness. He was elected a Fellow of the Institute in 1905, and in recent years he was assisted by his son, Richard Temple Moore (drowned in s.s. "Leinster"), and his partner, Mr. Leslie Moore [F.], by whom he wished the honoured tradition of his practice to be carried on.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Westminster Cathedral.

19, St. James's Street, Sheffield: 2nd July, 1920.

To the Editor, JOURNAL R.I.B.A.,—

SIR,—I have not had the good fortune to see Mme. de l'Hôpital's work on *Westminster Cathedral and its Architect*, reviewed by Mr. H. H. Statham in the current number of the JOURNAL.

The latter is in error in stating that Bentley's letter, quoted by him at the foot of page 397, was addressed to Professor Lethaby. The letter in question is one of a long series written to my late father, and it is before me as I write. It bears the date, 13th January, 1902.

May I also express my surprise at the appearance in the pages of the JOURNAL of such a remark as that contained in the concluding sentence of this review?—Yours faithfully,

CHARLES M. HADFIELD [F.].

* * It is correct that Bentley's letter was in fact written to Mr. Hadfield. The reviewer of the book writes that the mistake arose from Professor Lethaby's name occurring in the line immediately above the quotation in the book.—ED.

R.I.B.A. Record of Honour.

TRACY, BERNARD DAVID, Captain R.G.A., *Associate*. Wounded 6th September, 1918, and awarded the Military Cross (*Gazette*, 3rd June, 1919).

DURST, AUSTIN, Captain R.E., *Licentiate*. Mentioned in Dispatches July, 1919.

Award of the Donaldson Silver Medal.

On the recommendation of Professor A. E. Richardson [F.], the Donaldson Silver Medal, provided out of funds held in trust by the Institute, has been awarded to Mr. R. C. White-Cooper, a student of the University of London.



9 CONDUIT STREET, REGENT STREET, W., 31st July 1920.

CHRONICLE.

R.I.B.A. Reception and Garden Party in Honour of ex-Service Members.

The Reception and Garden Party held by the President and Council of the Institute at the Zoological Gardens on Tuesday, 29th June, in honour of the return to civil life of the large numbers of Members, Licentiates and Students of the Institute who served in the Army or Navy during the Great War was a highly successful and most pleasurable function. The weather, which early in the day seemed a little unpromising, turned out later all that could be desired for such a gathering and such an occasion. With the summer heat tempered by cool, refreshing breezes, it was under the most agreeable conditions that the guests could sit or stroll about in the brilliant sunshine, meeting their friends and listening to the excellent music performed by the band of the Irish Guards. The attractions outside the enclosure were also not to be denied, and the opportunity of hunting up old acquaintances and forming new ones among the regular denizens of the Gardens was largely taken advantage of. The company numbered little short of a thousand persons gathered from all parts of the country, the chief centres being well represented. The guests of the day, the ex-Service men, it was gratifying to note, were in considerable force, and a few wore their uniforms. The President, supported by the Vice-Presidents and Hon. Secretary, received the guests in the Zoological Society's fine Library, the ex-Service men being announced by the rank they had held in the Services. Refreshments were served at tables under an extensive marquee, open at the sides, which was set up on the Great Lawn, specially reserved for members and guests. Plans of the Gardens were provided to facilitate perambulation. Among those present may be mentioned Sir Aston Webb, P.R.A., and Lady Webb, Sir David Murray, R.A., Sir Edwin Lutyens, R.A., Sir John Burnet, R.S.A., Sir Henry Tanner, Sir Frederick Kenyon, Sir Francis Fox, Sir Charles Woodstock, Sir Israel Gollancz, Sir Cooper Perry, Major Barnes, M.P., and Mrs. Barnes, the Presidents of representative learned, artistic and professional institutions, the Mayors of important London boroughs, the Masters and Wardens of several of the great City Companies, etc.

Dinner to Mr. Cass Gilbert.

Mr. Cass Gilbert [*Hon. Corr. M.*], the eminent American architect, and President of the American Institute of Arts and Letters, who has just concluded a short visit to this country, was entertained to dinner by the Institute Council Dinner Club at the Café Royal, on the 19th inst. The President, Mr. John W. Simpson, was in the chair, having on his right Mrs. Cass Gilbert, Sir John Burnet, R.S.A., Lady Lawrence Weaver, Sir Reginald Blomfield, R.A., and Mr. Paul Waterhouse, and on his left Mr. Cass Gilbert, Lady Burnet, Sir Lawrence Weaver, Sir Banister and Lady Fletcher and Dr. R. Tait McKenzie. The company included also Professor Gerald Moira, Mr. John Slater, Mr. A. W. S. Cross, Mr. and Mrs. George Hubbard, Mr. W. E. Riley and Miss Riley, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Keen, Mr. Lewis Solomon, Mr. and Mrs. Digby Solomon, Mr. D. Barclay Niven, Mr. and Mrs. Vincent Harris, Mr. Maurice B. Adams, Mr. Max Clarke, Mr. Wm. Woodward, Mr. C. S. Errington, Mr. T. Taliesin Rees, Mr. T. Geoffrey Lucas, Mr. Andrew N. Prentice, Mr. W. R. Davidge, Mr. Septimus Warwick, Mr. and Mrs. Maurice Webb, Mr. Stanley Hamp, Mr. and Mrs. Curtis Green, Mr. W. B. Whitie, Mr. H. T. Kibblewhite, Mr. W. T. Plume, Mr. H. W. Wills, Major and Mrs. Maxwell Ayrton, Mr. W. G. Newton, Mr. and Mrs. Ian MacAlister.

The President, in proposing the health of the guest of the evening, said that they welcomed him not only as a great master of the profession, but as a representative of a great Ally, and in view of the importance of a complete accord between America, France and England, the more we saw of one another the better. Perhaps we trusted too much to the fact that Americans and ourselves spoke the same tongue, but in any case there was one great desire in the minds of our people, viz., to secure, above all trade conditions or signed agreements, a solid lasting basis of mutual goodwill based on frankness and honesty of conversation. Politics and commercial interests, even sports, were a loose and unsafe bond; the one broad, prominent contact point between civilised nations was Art, and it was to be hoped that this visit of Mr. Gilbert's would form another step towards a closer intimacy between the two peoples, which would only come from personal knowledge, respect and friendship.

Mr. Gilbert, in responding, said that he came first to London as a boy forty years ago, with a desire to enter an English architect's office. The times were dull, and there was no opportunity. He well remembered, however, having a letter of introduction to that great architect, Alfred Waterhouse, whom he visited several times. John L. Pearson, who was then building Truro Cathedral, he also met, and René Spiers, who showed him how he should really draw a Gothic arch. He remembered, too, George Edmund Street, then building the Law Courts. This first visit of his seemed a very long time ago, but it was all as fresh as ever in his memory. In a way, whenever he came to England he felt that he was coming home.

The only other toast given besides the loyal toasts was that of "The Ladies," proposed by Mr. Waterhouse and responded to by Lady Banister Fletcher in a speech which greatly delighted the company by its brilliancy and wit.

Mr. Gilbert, at the President's pressing request, had brought with him a number of slides illustrative of his buildings, and later in the evening these were thrown upon the screen, and the architect, acting as guide, conducted the company over the famous Woolworth Building, giving details of its construction and calling attention to special points of interest. The height of the building from the pavement level to the top of the main roof, at the 31st floor level, is 400 ft., the tower (86 ft. by 84 ft. at its base) being an additional 270 ft. in height from the 31st floor to the 50th, from which level rises a pyramid 105 ft. high and 54 ft. square at the base, containing the five highest floors, and an observation gallery at a height of 730 ft. Thus, the building in all comprises 55 storeys, of an average height of 12 ft. 6 in., the total height being 796 ft. from the pavement level and 810 ft. from the foundation grillages to the top of the tower. There are only two storeys below ground, the cellar floor being 37 ft. 6 in. below street level.

The President's citation of Walt Whitman on this occasion was the happiest of inspirations:—

*Brain of the New World, what a task is thine,
To formulate the Modern—out of the peerless grandeur of the
modern,
Out of thyself, comprising science, to recast poems, churches,
art,
(Recast, may-be discard them, end them—may-be their work
is done, who knows?)
By vision, hand, conception, on the background of the mighty
past, the dead,
To limn with absolute faith the mighty living present.*

National Housing Competition: Selected Designs for
Erection at Hammersmith.

The London County Council have accepted a tender for the erection on the Old Oak Estate, Hammersmith, of the 18 cottages to be built according to designs premiated in the competition conducted by the R.I.B.A. by arrangement with the Local Government Board in 1917-18. The architects are: Mr. Courtenay M. Crickmer [*F.*]-first premium, Class A, Home Counties Area; Mr. F. C. W. Barrett—2nd premium; Mr. Alfred Cox [*F.*]-first premium, Class B; Mr. C. Wontner Smith [*F.*]-2nd premium. The scheme is the outcome of a suggestion made to the Government by Mr. Henry T. Hare, when President, that a group of houses should be erected from the premiated designs to serve as models in connection with the Government Housing Schemes, and in such a locality in or near London as to be ultimately available for normal occupation by working-class families. Arrangements were made with the London County Council by the late Lord Downham (then Mr. Hayes Fisher, President of the Local Government Board) to

provide a site and to carry out the scheme in conjunction with the Institute. The houses will be provided by the London County Council in pursuance of their powers under Part III. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890. The tender accepted amounts to £2,112, and there will be an additional expenditure estimated to amount to £1,888 for architects' and surveyors' fees, supervision, lithography, &c.

Proposed Means of accelerating House Building.

The Cabinet, it was stated a few days ago in *The Times*, is considering a new scheme for the acceleration of the Government housing programme. It is proposed that, where local authorities are not making good progress with their schemes, the Office of Works should be entrusted with the work. This is already being done by arrangement in a few localities, and a Housing Board has been established at the Office of Works under its chief architect, Sir Frank Baines. Under the new scheme, the Ministry of Health will buy the materials, and provide the money for building, leaving the local authority to repay the full amount with interest in three years.

The insufficiency of building labour, to which is ascribed the slow progress of the housing scheme, the Cabinet considers can only be made good by a measure of dilution of building labour. It is understood that the plan of the Cabinet is to guarantee employment to men engaged in house building for a term of years and to insure them against time lost on account of bad weather by the payment of a weekly minimum wage. The Government will ask the trade unions in return to accept three conditions—dilution, relaxation of the present rules of apprenticeship, and employment of ex-Service men.

The Housing Subsidy [*ante*, p. 406].

The Ministry of Health announces that the Housing (Additional Powers) Act, 1919, which authorised grants to private persons building houses, lays down the conditions that the houses must be begun within twelve months from the passing of the Act—viz., 23rd December 1919, and completed within that period or such further period not exceeding four months, as the Minister of Health may in a special case allow. It is found that this period is not long enough for the erection of the houses which might otherwise be built under the stimulus of the subsidy, and the Government has decided to introduce legislation to extend the period for a further year. It is not proposed that the aggregate amount of £15,000,000 authorised by the Act for grants shall be increased.

Building Materials and Construction Research.

A Building (Materials and Construction) Research Board has recently been established under the Scientific and Industrial Research Department for the purpose of considering the conduct of research on building materials and methods of construction. The personnel of the Board is as follows:—The Marquess

of Salisbury, K.G., G.C.V.O., &c. (chairman); Sir Aston Webb, K.C.V.O., C.B., P.R.A., formerly President R.I.B.A.; Major-General Sir Gerard Heath, K.C.M.G., C.B., D.S.O., lately Engineer-in-Chief to the British Armies in France; Mr. C. W. Humphreys, C.B.E., M.Inst.C.E., Chief Engineer, London County Council, with Mr. S. B. Russell [F.], of the Ministry of Health, and Mr. A. R. Myers [A.], of H.M. Office of Works, as Associate Members. Mr. H. O. Weller has been appointed Director of Building Research under the Department.

The Preservation of Westminster Abbey.

The Dean of Westminster appeals to the entire English-speaking world for funds for the repair and upkeep of Westminster Abbey. The means at the disposal of the Dean and Chapter, he says, no longer suffice for its upkeep. The sum of money fixed more than fifty years ago for the maintenance of the fabric and for the services of the Abbey has become utterly inadequate for the purpose. High prices and high wages have brought the custodians to the verge of bankruptcy, and they are no longer able to pay their way. The building is in danger of entering upon a phase of steady structural deterioration. There is immediate need for (1) the repair of the two great western towers; (2) the reparation of the external stonework of Henry VII.'s Chapel; (3) the renovation of a large portion of the parapet running round the roof; (4) the repair of the clerestories and flying buttresses. A continual large outlay is required for the maintenance in proper repair of the much-decayed cloisters and the ancient dwellings.

The Dean asks for £250,000. Of this the sum of £100,000 is required for immediate structural repairs. The remaining sum, he urges, should constitute a fund by which the whole Abbey and any buildings of which the Dean and Chapter are the custodians should in future time be kept in a constant condition of complete efficiency and repair, and be finally freed from the humiliating necessity of appeals. The Dean has secured as trustees the Governor of the Bank of England, the Marquis of Salisbury (High Steward of Westminster), and Sir Robert Hudson.

The Times of the 29th June lent powerful support to the appeal by the presentation to its readers of a beautifully illustrated Special Supplement consisting of a series of interesting articles in which the Dean, Professor W. R. Lethaby [F.] (Surveyor of the Abbey) and others to whose hands the immediate care of the building is committed explain the needs or recall the story of the foundation whose stones they reverence and love. A further valuable contribution was *The Times'* eloquent three-column leader of the same date tracing some of the chief figures and indicating generally the colouring of the immense tapestry of which the Abbey has been for a thousand years, and is to-day, the centre and the life—a living tapestry whose warp and woof are the minds and the souls of men.

The King has headed the subscription list with a

donation of £1,000, and the Council of the Institute have voted a contribution of one hundred guineas. All contributions should be addressed to "The Right Rev. the Dean of Westminster, D.D., The Deanery, Westminster Abbey, S.W.1." Cheques should be made out to "The Dean of Westminster or Bearer," and crossed "Bank of England." A roll containing the names of all contributors of £5 and upwards will be formed and duly preserved among the Abbey's historic documents.

Commenting upon the Institute's contribution to the Fund, *The Times* says:—

The gift of the Royal Institute of British Architects may be taken as proof that that eminent body is satisfied that the repair and preservation of the Abbey are in good hands. There is a touch of irony in the idea that while the Government appears to be planning a new and grandiose memorial in the Egyptian style, Westminster Abbey, the great national memorial of our saints and heroes, "the chief and central work of our English art," should be begging for money to preserve its hallowed walls from decay. But so it is. On the people, not the nation as a political term, falls the privilege of keeping the Abbey in repair; and a cheque sent to the Abbey Fund would be a sound protest against any such expenditure of public money as is proposed.

Professor Lethaby, in *The Times* of the 9th July, gives the following account of the fabric repairs:—

I have been asked to give some idea of "how long the necessary repairs to Westminster Abbey will take," and I can only reply, "For ever."

The repairing of the Abbey buildings must have been continuous from the time when the scaffolding was struck, and it will necessarily continue to the end. It is not possible to apply any once-for-all policy; it is a question of constant attention and expenditure. All the great buildings of cathedral scale need repair year by year, and Westminster especially so because of the acid and disintegrating nature of the London atmosphere, and also, perhaps, because of incessant vibration caused by heavy traffic.

During the last century a very large aggregate must have been expended on even absolutely necessary repairs. The last heavy piece of work of this kind, completed only about two years ago, was the practical renewal, or rather re-renewal, of the external masonry of the south transept. This had been cased over about the year 1705, by the general advice of Wren, with new facing work. It was carefully done in a way, but the stones were very thin—only three and four inches thick—set on edge with practically no bond. I believe they called the process "flagging," and they must have trusted to the many necessary turns around the buttresses to give it stability. It answered wonderfully for about two centuries and then it was found that it was "coming away," like a damp wallpaper, from the solid work behind, and the damp was here also the cause. This thin and rotted skin had to be entirely removed—a work of difficulty, and indeed of danger—to be replaced by good, well-bonded masonry in Portland stone. As patches of this loose work were removed, the original faces of the thirteenth-century building thus revealed were found to be weathered into shapelessness. The original stone was from quarries at Reigate, and the casing had been executed in Oxfordshire stone. Neither of these will now stand the atmospheric conditions of big cities. Experience has shown that Portland stone, of which St. Paul's Cathedral is built, may best be trusted to resist modern London requirements. This stone has been used for all external repairs done during the last 20 years.

At the present time the works more immediately requiring attention are the external masonry of Henry VII.'s

Chapel, especially the clerestory, flying buttresses and turrets, and also the great western towers. Henry VII.'s Chapel was refaced about a century ago so completely that hardly one really ancient stone of the exterior remains. The interior, however, on the contrary, has fortunately been little touched, and remains authentic medieval work. The external casing was very carefully done, but here again the stone was not of a kind and quality to stand long against the London air attack. Much of it is badly decayed, and projecting parts have fallen away.

The great western towers, built about 1730–40, are of carefully selected Portland stone, which has stood admirably on the surface; but here, unfortunately, iron cramps and bars were used in the construction, with the consequence that as they rust they burst off parts of the external face, and fragments frequently fall. Any extensive repair to these towers will require heavy and costly scaffolding, thus greatly increasing the necessary expenditure.

The parapets of open quatrefoils are in many places much decayed, but again these are not of original medieval work. Indeed, it is true of the main fabric as of Henry VII.'s Chapel that hardly an original external stone remains, and some parts, such as these parapets, must have been renewed more than once. So far as I know, there is no immediately dangerous structural failure like the sinking of foundations or moving of the vaults, but it seems obvious that to keep the buildings in efficient order will require an ever-increasing expenditure.

Besides the larger works such as those described, there is an even more constant stream of minor repairs, such as relaying worn pavements, keeping the lead roofs in condition, renewing broken glazing, and cutting out single stones which have perished.

Mr. Frederic Harrison, having urged that the work of repair should be under the charge of an engineer, was taken to task by Mr. Arthur Keen, Hon. Secretary of the Institute, in a letter to *The Times* of the 10th inst.

"Mr. Frederic Harrison's words" (said Mr. Keen) "command the respect of all who value our ancient buildings, and if he had written them fifty or sixty years ago he would have helped to save many precious things from extinction; at the present time he is only pushing at an open door where he pleads for conservative treatment of the stones of Westminster Abbey. The architect in charge of the Abbey is well known as one of our strongest and most faithful opponents of restoration, and as one whose judgment on matters of mediæval art is perhaps more final than that of any other. To put the maintenance of ancient sculpture or tracery into the hands of an engineer would be to court disaster. The qualifications required by those who deal with the repair of ancient buildings are profound knowledge of the methods of the old masons, the fullest sympathy with their work, and the most refined skill in handling it, and the engineer neither possesses nor claims these qualifications.

"One knows all about the 'restorations' of the Gothic Revival, but architects have realised, as everyone else has realised, what has been lost, and they are quite alive to the value of what remains. The destruction which they are concerned about at the present time is that which threatens the churches of the City of London. If these churches are allowed to go the time will come when the loss of them will be regarded in the same way as the loss of the stones and the furniture of our mediæval churches, gone beyond recall."

The Threatened City Churches.

The Records and Museums Committee of the London County Council have reported that the nineteen City

churches recommended for demolition by the Bishop of London's Commission comprise some of the most interesting buildings in the City of London, and include churches which, on account of their architectural beauty and historic associations, are worthy of preservation. The Committee are of opinion that the loss that would result from the destruction of more than one-third of the remaining Wren churches would be irreparable, and some of the threatened buildings erected by his successors could ill be spared. At the meeting of the Council a resolution was passed deploring the recommendations of the Commission.

A Proposed National War Memorial.

The Times of the 14th inst. published a drawing illustrating a design for a National War Memorial by Sir Frank Baines, Principal Architect of the Office of Works. The Memorial, it was stated, was designed for a commanding position at Hyde Park Corner. It is in the form of a gigantic pylon, towering 160 feet above the floor of the Great Hall (75 feet by 55 feet) at its base, with two flanking temples on a higher platform, the floor areas measuring 58 feet by 28 feet. The following description was given of the monument:

The style of the design is Egyptian, the artist evidently feeling that the Egyptian period is the most suitable for immense scale and grandeur. His ambition clearly is that the monument should be the most distinctive object in London.

On each side of the great pylon two broad stairways approach and pass through the two flanking temples at its sides, and by a platform sweep round the back of it and into its great arch. An immense bas-relief marches up parallel with the stairways on each side through the flanking temples and into the great arch of the pylon, and on it there are figured the outstanding incidents and lessons of the effort of the British Empire in the war. From the bas-reliefs as they enter the arch of the pylon there fly upwards to the mighty lintel of the arch the disembodied spirits of the dead, pouring over the edge of the lintel 100 feet from the floor to the face of the pylon in immense cloudy forms, which in turn are surmounted by a great frieze on which a gigantic symbol of Immortality is carved. At the base of the pylon a single bronze figure of a youth is placed, looking upward at the flying forms of the dead, typifying our new manhood learning the lesson of the sacrifices of the race in the war.

The drawings were hung in the tea-room of the House of Commons for the inspection of members.* Replying to questions in the House, Sir Alfred Mond, First Commissioner of Works, said that the design was prepared by Sir Frank Baines entirely on his own initiative and in his own time. It had never been put forward for official consideration, and he had never contemplated submitting it to the Cabinet. He had allowed the drawings to be exhibited at the request of a member of the House. No memorial could be erected out of public funds without the approval of the House of Commons, which would have to sanction the expenditure. Later, in reply to Sir S. Hoare (Chelsea), Sir Alfred Mond said that he regarded this particular scheme for a National War Memorial as "quite dead."

* *The Builder* of the 23rd inst. published reproductions of the drawings—plans, elevations and perspectives.

The Press has published a number of letters condemning the design. Mr. Stephen Paget, quoting the passage in the description about "the disembodied spirits of the dead, in immense cloudy forms, flying upwards," says:—

Who thinks of them like that? Why do they fly upwards? Heaven is not overhead. How can disembodied spirits be embodied in cloudy forms? What is the symbol of Immortality? How shall we know it when we see it? Why should spirits, enjoying the reality of Immortality, fly to a symbol of Immortality? What can the Office of Works tell us about Immortality? . . .

Of the style of the design, Mr. Paget says:—

Of all styles unfit for London and alien to London, the Egyptian is the most unfit and alien; and the bigger it might be, the more vulgar it would be. It is heavy, passive, sulky; it is the style of a caste-ridden people; it requires the sunlight and the desert; it would show the dirt; it proclaims complete indifference to the hard estate of the poor.

Mr. Selwyn Image characterises the design "as one of pure pagan swagger. In every way it might have suited Berlin under the dominance of the ex-Kaiser."

Sir Thomas G. Jackson thinks the symbolism which is introduced "as little suited to modern ideas as the Pylon is itself. Symbolism belongs to the time when people could not read and had to be taught by pictures instead. It lost its meaning as knowledge spread, and was brushed aside by artists as art matured. The higher art really began when symbolism ended."

The Times of the 15th inst. published the following letter from the President of the Institute, sent before the drawings were exhibited and before Sir Alfred Mond's explanation in the House:—

13th July 1920.

SIR,—With grief and indignation I learn from your Parliamentary Notes of the proposal that H.M. Office of Works should design the National War Memorial. Are the architects who gave up all to fight for us already forgotten, that they are to be allowed no opportunity to concentrate their talent to the memory of their fallen comrades?

I make no reflection on the design placed before the House of Commons, of which I know nothing beyond the description you publish—still less do I belittle the ability of its author—but I protest very earnestly against employing a Government Department to produce the monument which, above all others, should represent the finest art of our country. Its designer should be chosen with the utmost care, and his merit proved by work submitted in public competition.

I am, Sir, your obedient faithful servant,
JOHN W. SIMPSON, *President*.

Appointment in Shanghai for Fully Qualified Assistant.

The President publishes the following letter for the information of Members and Licentiates. Candidates for the post offered should address their application in the first place to the Secretary R.I.B.A.

22 Yuen Ming Yuen Road, Shanghai; 10 April 1920

The President R.I.B.A.,—

DEAR SIR,—Will you be good enough to select a fully qualified senior architect's assistant for us? The type of man we require is one capable of taking entire charge, if

necessary, of a fairly large and varied practice. The practice includes domestic work, office buildings, warehouses, valuations of property, and now and again a little Gothic.

A knowledge of reinforced concrete would be acceptable, but not essential.

Apart from his professional ability, the class of man we desire is one likely to inspire confidence in our clientèle and eventually bring in work, for it must be understood that in China such an assistant more rapidly becomes identified with and a part of his firm than in England.

If enquiries are made with regard to the climate of Shanghai, you can safely reply that it is quite a healthy place. Two or perhaps three of the summer months are hot, but the life is a pleasant one, with abundance of sport of all kinds obtainable.

The following are the principal terms of the agreement: Three years.

Salary—350.00, 400.00 and 450.00 Taels per month; to commence from date of joining us in Shanghai.

A bonus on a sliding scale according to profits for successful year's working.

£50 allowed for outfit and incidental travelling expenses to Shanghai.

Passage out 1st class and home again if no new agreement is entered into.

A short holiday each summer.

Cannot practise in Shanghai or Hankow for 2 years after completion of agreement.

We can confidently state that this opening is a good one, and the salary offered considerably more than that customarily received by a man coming out to China for the first time.

In the event of a new agreement being entered into, six months' leave on half salary would be granted with passage money, and it is to be understood that our intention in taking an assistant is to obtain a man who would, in due course, work his way into the firm.

The Tael is a variable quantity, at present standing at 7s., exceptionally high, of course. The average for the past six years is approximately 4s.

All living expenses are either in Taels or Dollars, the latter being in proportion to the former approximately as 75 is to 100, in other words if the Tael is 4s., the Dollar would be 3s. The monthly living expenses for board and lodging in a good mess or hotel would be in the region of \$150, or, say, Ts.120.

The successful candidate must be single, and have no immediate contemplation of matrimony. Also, we desire a man of temperate habits, healthy, athletically inclined, having good presence and gentlemanly bearing, and an Associate of the Royal Institute by preference.

The selected man must leave at earliest possible date by quickest route. Very hot weather clothing need not be brought, except enough for the voyage out. This can be bought locally more suitably and more cheaply. All necessary books and instruments to be brought.

The selected candidate to be passed by a doctor as fit—bearing in mind the two or three months' hot weather.

For cost of passage out please apply to the Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation, London, to whom we have written by same mail.—Yours faithfully,

STEWARTSON & SPENCE [Associates R.I.B.A.].

Timber Supplies: Inquiry into Imperial Resources.

Mr. H. D. Searles-Wood [F.], in a letter to *The Times*, refers to the Empire Timber Exhibition now being held, and mentions that an important inquiry is being carried on at the Imperial Institute by the Advisory Committee on Timbers, of which he is Chairman. The object of the inquiry is to find out the particular uses to which the various timbers can be put, and which of them exist in sufficient quantity and can be exported at such prices as will enable them to enter the markets of this and other

countries of the Empire. The Committee include architects nominated by the Royal Institute of British Architects; builders nominated by the Institute of Builders; representatives of the timber trades nominated by the Timber Trades Federation; and of furniture manufacturers nominated by the National Federation of Furniture Manufacturers. The Carpenters' Company also has appointed a representative on the Committee. The Secretary of the Committee is a member of the scientific staff of the Imperial Institute. The Committee are considering in turn the chief timbers of each country of the Empire, and selecting those which are sufficiently promising to submit to appropriate technical tests in the laboratories of the Imperial Institute and practical trials by manufacturers and others. The Committee are in communication with the Governments concerned, and have already made reports and taken action, chiefly regarding the timbers of Canada, New Zealand, India, North Borneo, and West Africa. These reports and those relating to timbers from other sources will be published in due course. The Committee will be glad to receive communications from all who have knowledge of undeveloped timber resources within the Empire which may be suitable for structural or decorative purposes, and will reply to any inquiries addressed to them at the Imperial Institute, where representative collections of the timbers referred to may be seen and special information obtained.

Proposed Seven Dials Improvement Scheme.

A proposal has been made for the development of part of the district of Seven Dials by clearing practically the whole area south of Broad Street, from Shaftesbury Avenue to the junction of High Holborn and New Oxford Street. The scheme, which emanates from Sir George Parker, ex-Mayor of Holborn, would displace about 4,500 dwellers in poor tenements, for whom accommodation would have to be found elsewhere. It involves the purchase of properties covering about 13 acres, and the land cleared would be devoted to buildings for commercial purposes and the provision of broader traffic ways, including a wide road from Cambridge Circus to the corner of New Oxford Street, opposite the Holborn municipal offices. The cost of the scheme is put at from £4,000,000 to £5,000,000; but it is estimated that the rateable value of the area, now £55,000 per annum, would be raised to £350,000.

Competition for the Liège Defence Memorial.

The programme and conditions of competition for designs for the monument at Liège to commemorate the defence of Belgium against the German invader may be consulted in the Institute Library. Plans of the two prepared sites for the monument may be had by forwarding an international money order for 5 fr. to M. Léon Maréchal, Secrétaire de la Commission d'Etude du Projet du Monument, Bureau des Beaux-Arts, Hôtel de Ville, Liège. The competition, which will be in two stages, is open to all architects and sculptors of the Allied nations, singly or in collaboration. The estimated cost of the monument, apart from the lay-out of the site, is put at 1,000,000 fr., and 100,000 fr. is to be distributed in premiums—10,000 fr. to the authors of the designs considered meritorious in the preliminary competition but not admitted to the final, and 90,000 fr. for premiums in the second stage. Each participant in the final competition will receive a premium of not less than 5,000 fr. The jury will consist of Belgian and French sculptors and architects, delegates respectively of

the State, province and town, and two delegates chosen by the Commission. Designs submitted in the preliminary competition must be sent in not later than the 1st December next.

"Ideal Public House": Drawings on View at the Institute.

One hundred and ninety designs were submitted in the competition organised by Messrs. Samuel Allsopp & Sons, Ltd., for an "Ideal Public House," and the premiums have been awarded as follows:—

First (£200).—Mr. W. Kidd, Chelsea.

Second (£175).—Mr. Charles C. Voysey, Gower Street, W.C.

Third (£125).—Mr. T. R. Lodge [A.], South Kensington. Mr. W. Curtis Green [F.] was the assessor.

The whole of the competition designs are on view in the R.I.B.A. Galleries, 9, Conduit Street, W., until the end of August.

Professional and other Announcements.

A Civil List pension of £70 has been granted to Mrs. Bentley, widow of Mr. J. F. Bentley architect of Westminster Cathedral, in recognition of her late husband's distinction as an architect.

MR. J. WILSON PATERSON, M.B.E. [A.], the architect-in-charge, received from the King a diamond scarf pin before His Majesty left Holyrood Palace as a mark of appreciation of the excellent manner in which the various arrangements had been carried out by the staff of H.M. Office of Works.

MR. F. T. W. GOLDSMITH [F.] has been elected Master of the Plasterers' Company.

MESSRS. KNAPP-FISHER [A.], Powell and Russell [A.], have moved from 33, Palace Street to 133, Ebury Street, S.W.1.

MR. GEOFFREY C. WILSON [A.] has joined the firm of Messrs. Bouchier, Tatchell and Galsworthy, of 25, Queen Anne's Gate, Westminster. The title of the firm will remain unchanged for the present.

MR. STEPHEN WILKINSON [F.] has removed from 32, Charing Cross, Whitehall, to 7, Victoria Street, Westminster. Telephone: Victoria 2174.

MR. ERNEST G. W. SOUSTER [A.] has removed from 13, John Street, Adelphi, to 3, St. James's Street, S.W.1.

THE EXAMINATIONS.

The Final: Alternative Problems in Design.

Instructions to Candidates.

1. The drawings, which should preferably be on uniform sheets of paper of not less than Imperial size, must be sent to the Secretary of the Board of Architectural Education, Royal Institute of British Architects, 9 Conduit Street, W., on or before the dates specified below.

2. Each set of drawings must be signed by the author, AND HIS FULL NAME AND ADDRESS, and the name of the school, if any, in which the drawings have been prepared must be attached thereto.

3. All designs, whether done in a school or not, must be accompanied by a declaration from the Student that the design is his own work and that the drawings have been wholly executed by him. In the preparation of the design the Student may profit by advice.

4. Drawings for subjects (a) are to have the shadows pro-

jected at an angle of 45° in line, monochrome, or colour. Drawings in subjects (b) are to be finished as working drawings. Lettering on all drawings must be of a clear, scholarly, and unaffected character.

Subject LII.

(a) AN OPEN WOODEN STAIR FOR AN HOTEL in a space of 30 feet deep by 15 feet wide, exclusive of width of a corridor on each floor. A lift is not to be included. Ground floor to first floor, 15 feet; first floor to second floor, 13 feet; second floor to third floor, 11 feet 6 inches; third floor to fourth floor, 11 feet 6 inches.

Drawings.—Plans, two sections, $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch scale, with $\frac{1}{4}$ full size details.

(b) CONVALESCENT HOME FOR FIFTY MEN WORKERS, on a hilly site, overlooking an industrial city.—Accommodation to include club room or lounge, writing room and common dining room, necessary bedrooms and staff accommodation.

Drawings.— $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch scale: plan, sections and two elevations.

Subject LIII.

(a) A GRAND ENTRANCE TO CROSS-CHANNEL TUNNEL, to take four lines normal gauge railroad tracks.

Drawings.— $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch section and elevation. Perspective drawing not larger than 14 inches by 10 inches, showing relation to surrounding country.

(b) A SWIMMING BATH AND GYMNASIUM FOR A PUBLIC SCHOOL—to accommodate 75 at a time.

Drawings.— $\frac{1}{2}$ inch scale: plan, section and two elevations.

Subject LIV.

(a) A VILLA WITH A COURTYARD FOR A HOT CLIMATE—villa to be of moderate size and in no case to have more than ten bedrooms.

Drawings.— $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch scale: plan, section and elevations; and $\frac{1}{4}$ -inch detail.

(b) A SMALL COUNTRY RAILWAY STATION in the Midlands, with usual accommodation for passengers and goods and further including a stationmaster's house with the B3 accommodation standard of the Ministry of Health.

Drawings.— $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch scale: plan, section and two elevations.

Dates for Submission of Designs in 1920-21

	Subj. LII.	Subj. LIII.	Subj. LIV.
United Kingdom	31st Aug.	30th Oct.	31st Dec.
Johannesburg	30th Oct.	31st Dec.	28th Feb.
Melbourne	30th Nov.	31st Jan.	31st Mar.
Sydney	30th Nov.	31st Jan.	31st Mar.
Toronto	30th Sep.	30th Nov.	31st Jan.

COMPETITIONS.

Working War Memorial.

The Competitions Committee desire to call the attention of Members and Licentiatees to the fact that the conditions of the above competition are unsatisfactory. The Committee are in negotiation with the promoters in the hope of securing an amendment. In the meantime, Members and Licentiatees are advised to take no part in the Competition.

ASSISTANTS.—Wanted, two good architectural Assistants, and a Junior, Address, "Box 275," The Secretary, R.I.B.A.

OFFICE.—Architect with spare office, Bedford Row district, offers same to architect starting practice in return for help in daytime. Telephone, name, etc. Address, "Box 278," The Secretary, R.I.B.A.

ASSOCIATE, age 35, able chief assistant of long standing, desires post as chief with prospects of partnership. Exceptionally good designer and draughtsman, experienced in all branches and accustomed to control large staff and take complete responsibility. Long experience of Housing. Rank and commissioned service in war. Present salary, £650 p.a.—Apply "Box 280," The Secretary R.I.B.A.

